BC

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

Under the Direction of
MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS, RT. REV. MGR. J. F. LOUGHLIN D. D., REV. JAMES P. TURNER AND MR. JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.
S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXVI.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1901.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

PHILADELPHIA:
211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

Entered according to Act of Congress,
in the year 1900,
By BENJAMIN H. WHITTAKER,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at
Washington, D. C.

70758

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE
Anglo-Saxon Missionary Methods—Bryan J. Clinch..........243
Apennines, An Old-Irish Monastery in the—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D..436
As Others See Us—W. F. P. Stockley........................278

Burns, C. S. C., Rev. James A. Catholic Secondary Schools...485

Campbell, D. D., Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Legal Tenure of the Roman Catacombs..147
Cardinal Mermillod—T. L. L. Teeling.......................757
Catholic Features in the Official Report on Education—J. J. O'Shea..125
Catholic Secondary Schools—Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C....485
Catholicity in Detroit, Two Centuries of—Richard R. Elliott...499
China, The Western Powers and—Bryan J. Clinch............ 4
Clinch, Bryan J. Anglo-Saxon Missionary Methods..........243
Clinch, Bryan J. The Western Powers and China............ 4
Clinch, Bryan J. The Work of the Philippine Commission.....625
Collectivism, The Principle of—Rev. William Poland, S. J...... 53
Common Prayer, The First and Second Books of—Very Rev. W. Fleming...338
Commonwealth, The Irish Policy of Cromwell and the—Rev. G. McDermot, C. S. P.................................... 20
Coupe, S. J., Rev. Charles. The Temporal Power............776
Crispi, From Silvio Pellico to Francesco—John J. O'Shea......798
Cromwell and the Commonwealth, The Irish Policy of—Rev. G. McDermot, C. S. P.................................... 20

Detroit, Two Centuries of Catholicity—Richard R. Elliott......499
Divine Element in Scripture-Revelation—Rev. Charles P. Grannan, D. D..353
Doctrinal Subterfuges, Royal Oaths and—John J. O'Shea......417
Dowling, B. A., A. E. P. R. The Greek Temples in Sicily.....694

Education, Catholic Features in the Official Report on—John J. O'Shea..125
Eleusis, The Mystic Rites of—Daniel Quinn..................742
Elliott, Richard R. Two Centuries of Catholicity in Detroit....499
Encyclical "De Jesu Christo Redemptore"...................163

PAGE
Encyclical "Graves de Communi"....................374
Ennodius and the Papal Supremacy, Saint—Very Rev. E. Maguire, D. D....................317, 523
Evolution by Natural Selection, The Rise and Fall of—Rev. S. Fitzsimons 87

First and Second Books of Common Prayer, The—Very Rev. W. Fleming....................338
Fitzsimons, Rev. S. The Rise and Fall of Evolution by Natural Selection 87
Fitzsimons, Rev. S. The True Critical Test of Natural Selection.559
Fleming, Very Rev. William. The First and Second Books of Common Prayer....................338
From Silvio Pellico to Francesco Crispi—John J. O'Shea......798

Galileo Galilei Linceo, Il Dialogo di—F. R. Wegg-Prosser..266, 453
Ganss, Rev. H. G. Luther and His Protestant Biographers....582
Glancing Backward on the Road—Most Rev. P. J. Ryan, D. D.. 1
Grannan, D. D., Rev. Charles P. Divine Element in Scripture-Revelation 353
Greek Temples in Sicily, The—A. E. P. R. Dowling, B. A......694

Harnack and His Critics on the "De Aleatoribus"—Rev. G. H. Joyce, S. J....................675

Il Dialogo di Galileo Galilei Linceo—F. R. Wegg-Prosser..266, 453
Irish Monastery in the Apennines, An Old—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D....................436
Irish Policy of Cromwell and the Commonwealth, The—Rev. G. McDermot, C. S. P.................... 20

Joyce, S. J., Rev. G. H. Harnack and His Critics on the "De Aleatoribus" 675
Joyce, S. J., Rev. G. H. The Source of Moral Obligations..... 41
Justinian the Great (A. D. 527-565)—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D....................209

Kerby, Ph. D., Rev. W. J. The Laborer and His Point of View.108
Kerby, Ph. D., Rev. William J. The Socialism of the Socialists.468

Laborer and His Point of View, The—Rev. W. J. Kerby, Ph. D.108
Legal Tenure of the Roman Catacombs—Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Campbell, D. D....................147
Luther and His Protestant Biographers—Rev. H. G. Ganss.....582

PAGE
Maguire, D. D., Very Rev. E. Saint Ennodius and the Papal Supremacy 317, 523
Maynooth, The Second Plenary Synod of—Rev. M. O'Riordan, D. D., D. C. L..136
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. The Irish Policy of Cromwell and the Commonwealth........................... 20
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. Spencer's Philosophy......643
Medicine, Microbes and—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D.......287
Mega Spelaeon, or the Monastery of the Great Cave—Daniel Quinn 70
Mermillod, Cardinal—T. L. L. Teeling......................757
Merrick, S. J., Rev. D. A. The Supernatural.................733
Michael Servetus and Some Sixteenth Century Educational Notes—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D...................714
Microbes and Medicine—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D........287
Missionary Methods, Anglo-Saxon—Bryan J. Clinch..........243
Moral Obligations, The Source of—Rev. G. H. Joyce, S. J...... 41
Mystic Rites of Eleusis, The—Daniel Quinn..................742

Natural Selection, The Rise and Fall of Evolution by—Rev. S. Fitzsimons 87
Natural Selection, The True Critical Test of—Rev. S. Fitzsimons.559

Old-Irish Monastery in the Apennines, An—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D..436
O'Riordan, D. D., D. C. L., Rev. M. The Second Plenary Synod of Maynooth...................................136
O'Shea, John J. Catholic Features in the Official Report on Education 125
O'Shea, John J. From Silvio Pellico to Francesco Crispi......798
O'Shea, John J. Royal Oaths and Doctrinal Subterfuges......417
O'Sullivan, S. J., Rev. D. T. Scientific Chronicle. 185, 396, 613, 819

Papal Supremacy, Saint Ennodius and the—Very Rev. E. Maguire, D. D.................................317, 523
Pellico to Francesco Crispi, From Silvio—John J. O'Shea......798
Philippine Commission, The Work of the—Bryan J. Clinch....625
Philosophy, Spencer's—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P.......643
Poland, S. J., Rev. William. The Principle of Collectivism..... 53
Principle of Collectivism, The—Rev. William Poland, S. J...... 53
Protestant Domination Over Weak Communities—James E. Wright 538

PAGE
Quinn, Daniel. Mega Spelaeon or the Monastery of the Great Cave ... 70
Quinn, Daniel. The Mystic Rites of Eleusis ... 742

Revelation, Divine Element in Scripture—Rev. Charles P. Grannan, D. D ... 353
Rise and Fall of Evolution by Natural Selection, The—Rev. S. Fitzsimons ... 87
Roman Catacombs, Legal Tenure of the—Right Rev. Mgr. J. A. Campbell, D. D ... 147
Royal Oaths and Doctrinal Subterfuges—John J. O'Shea ... 417
Ryan, D. D., Most Rev. P. J. Glancing Backward on the Road. 1

Saint Ennodius and the Papal Supremacy—Very Rev. E. Maguire, D. D ... 317, 523
Schools, Catholic Secondary—Rev. James A. Burns, C. S. C. ... 485
Scientific Chronicle—Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J. .185, 396, 613, 819
Scripture-Revelation, Divine Element in—Rev. Charles P. Grannan, D. D ... 353
Second Plenary Synod of Maynooth, The—Rev. M. O'Riordan, D. D., D. C. L ... 136
Servetus and Some Sixteenth Century Educational Notes, Michael—James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D ... 714
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J. An Old-Irish Monastery in the Apennines ... 436
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J. Justinian the Great (A. D. 527-565) ... 209
Sicily, The Greek Temples in—A. E. P. R. Dowling, B. A ... 694
Socialism of the Socialists, The—Rev. William J. Kerby, Ph. D. .468
Source of Moral Obligations, The—Rev. G. H. Joyce, S. J ... 41
Spencer's Philosophy—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P. ... 643
Stockley, W. F. P. As Others See Us ... 278
Supernatural, The—Rev. D. A. Merrick, S. J ... 733

Teeling, T. L. L. Cardinal Mermillod ... 757
Temples in Sicily, The Greek—A. E. P. R. Dowling, B. A ... 694
Temporal Power, The—Rev. Charles Coupe, S. J ... 776
True Critical Test of Natural Selection, The—Rev. S. Fitzsimons. 559
Two Centuries of Catholicity in Detroit—R. R. Elliott ... 499

Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., James J. Michael Servetus and Some Sixteenth Century Educational Notes ... 714
Walsh, M. D., Ph. D., James J. Microbes and Medicine ... 287
Wegg-Prosser, F. R. Il Dialogo di Galileo Galilei Linceo. 266, 453

Western Powers and China, The—Bryan J. Clinch............ 4
Work of the Philippine Commission, The—Bryan J. Clinch.....625
Wright, James E. Protestant Domination Over Weak Communities 538

BOOKS REVIEWED.

PAGE
Apologetik als Spekulative Grundlegung der Theologie,—Schmid 624
Beati Petri Canisii, Epistulae et Acta—Braunsberger..........414
Bible and Rationalism, The—Thein.........................616
Biblische Studien—Bardenhewer............................416
Breviarium Romanum.......................................832
Day in the Cloister, A—Von Oer............................617
Dictionary of the Bible—Hastings...........................202
Dionysii Cartusiani Opera Omnia...........................205
Divinity of Christ, The—Bougand...........................201
Exposition of Christian Doctrine...........................409
Faith and Folly—Vaughan..................................621
General History of the Christian Era, A—Guggenberger.......618
General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scriptures—Gigot...202
Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst—Kraus...................622
Geschichte der Weltliteratur—Baumgartner..................623
Great Supper of God, The—Coubé...........................620
Historical Memoirs of the City of Armagh—Stuart............206
History of America Before Columbus—De Roo................200
History of the Diocese of Hartford—O'Donnell...............623
History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages—Janssen 196
History of the Jesuits in England, The—Taunton.............614
Holy Year of Jubilee, The—Thurston........................204
In the Beginning—Guibert.................................613
Institutiones Metaphysical Specialis, Psychologia—De Backer..829
Institutiones Philosophiae Moralis—Castelein................829
Institutiones Theologicae Dogmaticae—Einig................414
Jesuit Relations, The................................198, 411
Last Years of St. Paul, The—Fouard........................206

PAGE
Law and Policy of Annexation, The—Randolph..............415
Meditations on Psalms Penitential.........................831
Meditations on the Life of Jesus Christ—Ilg..................412
New Raccolta, The..415
Orestes A. Brownson's Latter Life—Brownson...............205
Philosophia Lacensis—Meyer...............................407
Political Economy—Devas..................................619
Psychology—Maher...203
Scale of Ladder of Perfection, The—Hilton..................622
Short Lives of the Dominican Saints.........................413
Sister Mary Gonzaga Grace, Life of—Donnelly................199
Some Notes on the Bibliography of the Philippines—Middleton.195
Synodorum Archidioeceseos Neo-Eboracensis..................832

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVI.—JANUARY, 1901—No. 101.

GLANCING BACKWARD ON THE ROAD.

THE first quarter century of our existence closed with the last October issue. Therefore it is fitting that we should offer a few words as to the sentiments with which the occasion inspires us, as we look back, not without a certain sense of solemnity, on the wreck of years and the work accomplished, as well as the monumental urns which stand by the dim wayside. The hands that first presented the work to the world—saintly and capable hands, both cleric and lay, they were—are mouldering in dust; but their spirit survives in the intellectual organism which they called into being, animating it with undiminished zeal and desire in the prosecution of those high aims and ideals which formed the original inspiration.

When making its first bow before the world of learning this "Review" modestly but clearly defined its mission and its message. Its mission it declared to be to provide a vehicle for the highest thought which should be distinctively American as distinctively Catholic. To that definition it has rigidly adhered all these twenty-five years. More than once it has been suggested that the word "American" was injurious because suggestive of limitation. But this idea is illusory. In practice, the pages of the "Review" are open, and have been always open, to the whole world of Catholic thought. Nor has it excluded non-Catholic thought when this was presented by

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1900, by Benjamin H. Whittaker, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

minds made generous by that search for truth which distinguishes the conscientious student from the wavering and irresolute votaries of the midnight oil. Because it is proud of the country of its birth and its institutions, and proud of the progress which under these our indestructible Church has made, the editors stood firm in the resolve that this pride should find recognition in official title of their publication.

Rightfully, the exposition and defense of Catholic truth held the first place in the opening announcement of objects contemplated. To Philosophy and Science, as handmaids of religion, when not taken out of their proper atmosphere, due place was also assigned. To the muse of History, in its relation, especially to the Catholic Church on the American Continent, it was proposed to pay due honor. These were some of the intentions outlined in the first note of salutation. Since then the widening of the programme was seen to be necessary, for the development of the social propaganda and the birth of new ideas in many fields of thought and action have directed literary energies into channels hitherto undreamed of. All these topics have been discussed by the ablest hands in the "Review," concurrently with the unfolding of doctrinal truth and the patient investigation of its truth by the keen eyes of the ecclesiastical archæologist.

"We are not without misgivings, either as to the arduous nature or the probable success of our undertaking." So said the distinguished scholar who wrote the introductory lines; but he solaced himself for this incertitude of mind by remembering the line of the Umbrian lyrist:

"In magnis et voluisse sat est."

This almost Divine encouragement was indeed the great vivifying inspiration of the original founders, and it was rewarded by the addition of success beyond the utmost hope. The "Review" has had its fluctuations. It has had its prosperous periods—prosperous beyond all early anticipation—and its times of stagnancy, when it reflected in some measure the vicissitudes of fortune in the affairs of the nation at large.

Politics in the ordinary sense were excluded from the purview of the "Quarterly." But the ethics of politics, as the signatory observed on assuming control of the magazine, ten years ago, demand attention, because "when great moral questions are involved in political issues the illumination of sound principles must fall on the dark places and show men that the right alone is the truly expedient."

Great liberty of expression of opinion has been permitted, as announced in the Salutatory written ten years ago and published on the first page of the "Review" in these words: "Contributors to the 'Quarterly' will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the 'Review' not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

The idea of the "Review" may be attributed to the late Monsignor Corcoran. His great intellect led him to aspire to more for the literature of Catholicism than had been as yet attempted by any publication in the United States. He found a ready and responsive coöperation at the hands of the publishers of its predecessor, the *Catholic Record*, Messrs Charles A. Hardy and Daniel H. Mahoney. Down to the time of his lamented death Mr. Hardy continued to be the publisher of the magazine; and it is only just to say that his personal enthusiasm in the work all through had no small share in the determination of its success. Since his demise the responsibility for the magazine's production has devolved upon our own shoulders. The most trenchant and erudite pens that the Catholic world could boast of have constantly been impressed into the service of the Church, on this high plane of ambition, ever since the "Review" was ushered into the world. Monsignor Corcoran, its first editor, was a host in himself. He wrote much for its pages. Orestes Brownson, John Gilmary Shea, George Dering Wolff, Rev. Augustus Thebaud, S. J., Right Rev. James O'Connor, D. D., Rev. Edward McGlynn, D. D., Right Rev. T. A. Becker, D. D., Right Rev. P. N. Lynch, D. D., T. W. Marshall, LL. D.—these are a few of the names to be encountered in the pages of the very first number. Among the succeeding contributors are such names as those of Cardinal Gibbons, Cardinal Manning, Archbishop Keane, Archbishop Seghers, Bishop Spalding, Bishop Chatard, Bishop Walsh, Very Rev. Augustine Hewit, Monsignor Seton, Very Rev. John Hogan, S. S., D. D., Rev. Dr. Bouquillon, Very Rev. Canon O'Hanlon, Rev. Edward Pace, D. D., Rev. Dr. Zahm, Brother Azarias. These are only a few, picked up at random; but they will serve to show the class of aspirants which the founders of the magazine attracted to the cause on the announcement of their design to produce on the American Continent a Review of the highest order in a literary point of view—for which Seneca might possibly be too heavy and Plautus certainly too light—a work intended not to pass an idle hour in the boudoir, but to help the scholar by his lamp and the theologian in his study.

P. J. Ryan.

THE WESTERN POWERS AND CHINA.

THE outbreak in China has come on the close of the nineteenth century as suddenly as the French Revolution came on the eighteenth. There is a strange likeness between the early stages of the European convulsion and the events now passing in Asia. In each case the oldest Government of a continent has been suddenly assailed by revolution within and invasion from abroad. In each attempted reforms of society on theoretical principles have resulted in outbursts of savage ferocity among populations regarding themselves as civilized for many centuries. A year ago political economists were planning the transformation of China by railroads and modern machinery as, in 1789, philanthropists and savans urged the reconstruction of Europe on the theories of humanitarian science. In neither century did the would-be reformers reckon with the wishes or sentiments of the populations affected by their projects, and in both the populations have shown that old habits and thoughts are not to be changed with impunity by self-sufficient rulers.

The plans of social reorganization in China have not been confined to outsiders. Men like Li Hung Chang and the reigning Emperor have been for some years trying to introduce the science and political ideas of the West into the Middle Empire under the patronage of despotic power and for its benefit. In a similar way Catherine of Russia and Frederick of Prussia undertook to mould their governments on the philosophy of the encyclopedia. Despotic monarchs were as eager for social and religious changes as the French advocates of the rights of man, and, when power was thrown into their hands, the latter showed themselves as despotic in forcing their own ideas on others as either King or Emperor. The Taiping rebellion in China showed a similar spirit in the nineteenth century in Asia.

European and American theorists seem to have taken it for granted that the Imperial Government is all powerful over the Chinese population. It has only to concede privileges to foreigners, and the Empire may be moulded at will to the interests of trade and capital. In point of fact, the Chinese, during the nineteenth century, have been more turbulent than the populations of Europe during the first eighty years of the last century. In Paris popular disturbance had been unknown since the days of Mazarin and De Retz. In England no popular insurrection had occurred during the eighteenth century. In Spain and Germany the case was almost the same. The duty, or necessity, of submission to the existing governments was recognized by the population at large in every European country down to the French Revolution. If it seems to be equally so in China to-day there is no more assurance that the sentiment will continue if the public feelings are thoroughly excited than there was in France before the storming of the Bastille.

Indications are not wanting of a change in the impulses of the Chinese people similar to that which occurred in the France of Louis and La Fayette. They are found both in the Government and in popular outbreaks. Prince Tuan, the leader of the Boxers, has a striking resemblance to the regicide Duke of Orleans of the Revolution. The wavering action of the Chinese Court, now applauding, now denouncing the "anti-foreign" rioters, recalls the later Ministers of the unfortunate French monarch while his authority was still recognized in name as head of the government. The fraternization between the regiments of the royal army and the Paris rioters seems to have been repeated between the Imperialist soldiers and the Boxers in Pekin.

Atrocious as may have been the outrages committed by the Asiatic revolutionists, it should not be forgotten that even worse cruelties attended the progress of revolution in France. The butchery of the Ice Tower at Avignon, the wholesale drownings of Charries at Nantes, where men and women were tied together, in so-called Republican marriages, and sunk by hundreds in the Loire, the massacres at Lyons, at Toulon and a hundred other places, were as savage and far more extensive than any outrages lately reported from China. The slaughter of priests in the Abbey Prison of Paris was greater than that of all the missionaries slain in China in our own days. In Paris, the capital of European civilization, mobs tore men and women to pieces in blind fury and paraded the streets with the bleeding heads of their victims carried on pikes to the strains of music. The daughter of the Marquis de Cazotte, called to drink a bowl of human blood as the price of her old father's life, is as horrible as anything told of Chinese brutality. When human passions are let loose from moral restraint, no difference in savagery can be found between European, Asiatic or American man, between civilized society or barbarism. The Chinese mobs hack their Christian countrymen in pieces as "foreign devils," the civilized pagans of old Rome burned their Christians as "enemies of the human race," the Jacobin disciples of reason piked or shot Catholic priests as "foes of liberty," the Gordon rioters of London murdered Catholics as idolators. In deeds of cruelty the Chinese are not sinners above other men, and barbarity is confined to no race or time.

The intervention of the foreign powers as a consequence of the Boxer outbreak is another parallel between the France of the eighteenth century and China of the nineteenth. Even before the deposition of the King, the Emperor of Germany and the King of Prussia combined at Pilnitz to suppress by arms the revolution in France. Prussian and Austrian armies invaded its territory under claim of defending the common rights of society and royalty. A Prussian army attacked Verdun as the European fleets attacked the Taku forts, in the alleged interests of order. From Coblentz the Duke of Brunswick, as commander-in-chief of the allied invaders, issued his famous proclamation threatening Paris and all other French towns with military execution unless they at once restored their King to his former absolute power. The manifesto has a remarkable resemblance to the speech of the present German Emperor to his troops when sailing for China. The injunction to avenge the death of the murdered Embassador by a wholesale slaughter of Chinese is, indeed, more truculent than the "military execution" threatened by Brunswick. In politics the nineteenth century cannot boast of any ethical development between Brunswick and Kaiser Wilhelm.

The attack on revolutionary France was as unanimous as the late campaign against China. Austrian, Prussian and Sardinian armies invaded France in 1792, while Louis was still in name its constitutional King. On his execution England and Spain, as well as Russia, Sweden and Holland, joined in the attack. The motive alleged for this remarkable unanimity of usually hostile States was the suppression of anarchy in France, in the interests of European society. The excesses that had been committed by the revolutionary party when Brunswick's army entered Champagne were wholly confined to Frenchmen on French soil. The invading powers claimed an international right to enforce the continuance of monarchy in any country, as modern Imperialists claim the right to take over the government of dark-skinned peoples. The "white man's burthen" is but the "sacred rights of monarchy" under a new name.

The result of the German invasion on France was only to increase the violence of the revolution a hundredfold. The deposition of the King, the massacres of the Paris prisons, the establishment of the National Convention of Robespierre as the supreme authority and the execution of Louis followed in quick succession. Marat demanded two hundred and sixty thousand heads of aristocrats as a public necessity, and urged the organization of bands of murderers to accomplish it quickly. The churches were closed and the "Goddess of Reason" worshiped on the altar of Notre Dame. Three hundred thousand "suspects" filled the jails of France, and their numbers were daily thinned by the action of the guillotine. The

Reign of Terror was called into existence by the foreign invasion more than any other cause.

To the politicians of outside Europe it looked as if this condition of affairs left France at their mercy. Civil war was raging. La Vendée, Lyons, Toulon, Caen and a number of other cities took up arms against the Paris Convention. The national army had been demoralized by the recent events, and especially by the banishment or execution of nearly all its officers as suspected aristocrats. The Treasury was bankrupt, the administration in the hands of mob leaders without experience or training, the magazines empty of supplies and the population divided between the traditions of order and loyalty and the new republican ideas. The occupation of Paris and the conquest of France seemed as easy a task to the wise men of Berlin and London in 1793 as the conquest of China appears to-day to modern Imperialist eyes. Plans for the partition of its territory, of course in the interests of humanity, were put forward as freely as they now are in China's case. Austria wanted Alsace and French Flanders; Sardinia, Provence and Dauphiny; England, Corsica and the French colonies. A restored Bourbon might be left to rule the rest of the country under the armed protection of the other European powers.

The first progress of the invasion seemed to promise realization of these projects. Fifty Austrian hussars chased an army of French levies at Wisemberg; the Prussians captured the strong fortress of Verdun, so famous in the late Franco-Prussian war, almost without loss; the Sardinians and Spaniards marched unopposed into the French territory. There was wild panic in Paris. The Convention decreed a levy of three hundred thousand men and afterwards called every man between eighteen and twenty-five to immediate service. But there were neither arms nor ammunition to supply the means of defense; even clothing and shoes could not be found for the recruits. The sea was in the power of the hostile nations. The steel of Sweden and the nitre needed for powder making were both cut off by the war. Famine, too, was raging in France. The crops had been ruined between political disturbance and bad weather, and English and Dutch cruisers blockaded the ports and seized all vessels bringing the provisions of America to the starving nation. All the resources of civilization seemed combined in the hands of the allies against the distracted French people. The military discipline of the Prussian army under Frederick was as efficient as it was in our time under Von Moltke. Rosbach, thirty years before the Revolution, was as decisive a victory of Prussians over French soldiers as was Sedan since. With such a force at his disposal against the raw levies of Republican France, it is not strange that the march to Paris was regarded as little more dangerous than a military promenade. The whole population of France was only twenty-five millions. The nations combined against her disposed of a hundred and twenty millions. They controlled the sea and commerce as well as the capital of the world. Numbers, military organization, wealth and trained political intelligence were overwhelmingly against the French Republic.

They all failed to win success. Whatever the different views of Frenchmen on republicanism or monarchy, towards Jacobins or Girondists, the great majority felt that defense of their native land against invasion was their first duty. A flame of enthusiasm blazed through France and made the whole nation an army. The smiths were all impressed to make muskets, the tailors uniforms. All materials needed were seized wherever they could be found. Nitre was extracted from the mortar of cellars and the recruits were armed. Royalist officers, though liable to lose their heads as aristocrats at any moment, drilled the new levies and led them to victory. Dumouriez repulsed Brunswick at Valmy and saved Paris. The check was little more serious in effect than that which the allies met in their first advance towards Pekin, and was as little regarded at first by the invaders; but other lessons of war's uncertainties came thick and fast. Men from the ranks like Hoche and Pichegru took command of armies and defeated the veteran generals of Germany. The retired royalist officer, Dugommier, raised a force in the south which drove back the disciplined Spanish troops and invaded Spain. At Jemappe and Hondscoote, at Fleurus and at a score of other battles the new levies scattered the best armies of Germany and England. Within a few months after Valmy the Austrians had been driven out of their own territory of Belgium, and Holland was overrun and its navy captured by French cavalry while embedded in the ice of the Texel. The fortune of war was not, indeed, all on one side, and defeats like those of Neerwinden and Mayence came to vary the victories of the French armies; but within two years the heads of the European governments recognized that the conquest of France was beyond their power. Spain made peace in 1795 and Prussia the same year. Holland had been conquered, the King of Sardinia driven from his own capital. The English had seized Toulon, the chief naval station of France on the Mediterranean. They had also invaded Corsica, under protection of their fleets. They were driven from both. Napoleon won his first distinction at the recapture of Toulon as a captain of artillery. Within four years he had conquered Italy and dictated peace to the German Emperor at Leoben. The European coalition had collapsed. Its members had made war to prevent the establishment of republican institutions in France. Their efforts had resulted in surrounding a republican France with a border of dependent republics formed from the territories of its assailants. The Batavian, the Ligurian, the Cisalpine and the Parthenopean Republics had replaced the Stadtholder of Holland, the Kings of Sardinia and Naples and the German rule in Lombardy.

While defending their soil against invasion the French people had also put down the anarchy of the Jacobin faction in Paris. Robespierre had been overthrown and guillotined, after eighteen months of executions, and a Directory set up in his place. Napoleon had crushed a last rising of the anarchists before setting out to conquer Italy. Within four years more he had become absolute master in the new republican France. As First Consul and Emperor he became master of that Europe which had projected the partition of France ten years earlier. Austria, Russia, Prussia and Spain saw him in their capitals as a victorious invader. Kings of his family reigned in Spain and Holland, in Naples and Westphalia. A French general became Crown Prince of Sweden. Such was the result of the combination of Europe to regulate the government of the French people a hundred years ago. The lesson seems worth study at present.

The course of action of the different allied powers with regard to one another is also worthy of consideration. Setting out with proclamations of disinterested zeal for the maintenance of public order and international law, each power, in the course of the Revolutionary struggle, showed itself as unscrupulous in its acts as the French Jacobins. Prussia and Russia enslaved Poland the very year that Louis XVI. died on the scaffold. When the French made Holland a republican government England seized the African colonies of its late ally. Prussia, a little later, tried to make its own of Hanover from England. Austria accepted the Venetian territories from Napoleon as a compensation for the loss of Lombardy. Russia annexed Finland from Sweden because its boundary was too near St. Petersburg. England kept Malta from its legitimate rulers because it had been occupied by Napoleon on his voyage to Egypt. Nelson bombarded Copenhagen and seized the fleet of Denmark with no excuse except that Napoleon might do likewise. The twenty-two years, from Valmy to Waterloo, which followed the Convention of Pilnitz for intervention in France, were marked with more blood and international lawlessness than any century of European history. More than any other cause the policy of intervention of Leopold and Frederick William was responsible for this. Does the new principle of the "White Man's Burthen" offer better prospects in practice?

It hardly seems so. There is little in modern political history to indicate that any higher moral principle rules the governments of our day than those of the last century. England is annexing the Transvaal with as little pretext of right as Catherine of Russia and the Prussian King had for the dismemberment of Poland. Her power is checked for intervention in China precisely in the same way as Russia was at first hindered from active part in the invasion of France in 1793. The seizure of Kiao Tchou by the German Emperor was as flagrant an outrage on international right as Russia's occupation of Finland. The parallel between the King of Sweden, murdered by one of his own subjects when setting out to put down anarchy in France, and Humbert of Italy, similarly slain, while his soldiers were slaying Chinese to restore order in that Empire, is a very striking one. If lack of moral principles worked disastrous results among governments a hundred years ago, there seems reason to anticipate similar results from like causes now.

The recent history of most of the powers now engaged in restoring order in China gives little guarantee that the undertaking will be carried out with any more honesty among the partners than was the old coalition against France. The Italian Kingdom owes its origin to conquests of a character simply piratical. The invasions of Tuscany, of Parma, the Papal States and Naples were made without even pretext of right. The seizure of the African territory which forms the Italian colony of Erythræa was of a similar nature. The invasion of Schleswig, of Hanover and Hesse by Prussia showed equal disregard of national rights. The cynical hypocrisy of a government which refuses its own subjects the right to reside in Germany, if they belong to Catholic religious orders, and demands that China shall be invaded if she refuses protection to Catholic missionaries on her soil may be remarked.

It is scarcely different with France. Her late seizures of Tunis and Madagascar showed equal disregard of right with Prussia's occupation of Schleswig. England's occupation of Egypt, because a part of its people attempted to substitute European methods of government for Turkish despotism, is a copy of the policy which attempted to restore absolute monarchy in France last century. The conquests of Burma, Uganda and the South African republics are equally lawless. Russia's advance in Asia is of the same kind as the invasions of Timur or Mahomet II. There is small likelihood that regard for moral right or public opinion will sway the decisions of any of these powers in the disposal of China. The "ethical development" of the nineteenth century of Spencer and Huxley promises even less fruit than the doctrines of Rousseau and D'Alembert in the eighteenth. Indeed, the list of public violations of national rights by the armed hand of power is far longer in the later century than in its predecessor.

How slight the chances are that half a dozen allies will unite harmoniously in a scheme of plunder, history teaches us from the last century. It was from experience of the European coalition that Washington left to his countrymen his solemn warning against "entangling alliances" with any foreign power. Its observance saved America from being drawn into the Revolutionary struggle which devastated Europe for twenty-two years, which began with a Reign of Terror of anarchists and ended with a Holy Alliance of absolute monarchs.

The part which China itself may take in the struggle is still harder to anticipate. At the present her people seem helpless against modern war, with its scientific weapons and careful discipline; but France seemed scarcely more likely to successfully resist the armies of Europe when Brunswick issued his famous proclamation. The last twenty-five years have given ample illustration that in war the unexpected is always liable to happen. Modern discipline and arms did not save the Italian army from crushing defeat by the warriors of Abyssinia nor the British-led Egyptians under Hicks Pasha from annihilation by the Dervishes. The Boer war, where two hundred thousand British soldiers have been needed to conquer a population of three hundred thousand all told, is a still more striking instance of the uncertainties of war, even under modern conditions. The possibilities latent in the four hundred millions of Chinese are enormously greater than were those in the twenty-five millions of Revolutionary France. That the people have little of the military spirit of Western nations at present is true, but it is no guarantee that it may not be awakened in them as in other men by aggression carried too far. The Taiping rebellion and the Black Flags of Southern China are hints that the fighting spirit is not wholly absent from Chinese nature. The Russians to the time of Peter the Great were as little regarded as soldiers by their European neighbors as the Chinese to-day. A King of Sweden, in the eighteenth century, scattered fifty thousand of Peter's best troops with eight thousand Swedes at Narva. The same monarch traversed the whole of Russia as a conqueror with forty thousand men. The Russian peasantry to-day are as peaceable and scarcely more advanced in civilization than in the days of Peter, but the best soldiers of the world, from Frederick of Prussia to Napoleon, have found conquerors in the once despised Russian armies. The Mongol tribes, now a part of the Chinese Empire, have entered Europe as conquerors at least three times in modern history. The dominion of Kublai Khan and his successors for two centuries reached from the Yellow Sea to the Dnieper, and the Princes of Russia had to seek their investiture with power in a Tartar camp. It seems not impossible that the descendants of the old conquerors may learn the use of arms again as readily, at least, as the Russians have done already.

The permanent supremacy of the white race in the world, or of civilized over uncivilized man, are facts commonly assumed, but not borne out by the experience of the past. Nations of European race are strongest in the world to-day, as they were in the days of Augustus or Theodosius; but in the intervening centuries there were many in which the sceptre was held by others. The tribes of Arabia in sixty years built an Empire greater than the Roman and including half of its former dominion. The Turkish Sultan and the Great Mogul in the sixteenth century were superior in power to any European State. Francis I. of France and Elizabeth of England begged the alliance of Solyman the Magnificent in terms that seem incredible to French or English pride to-day. Higher civilization made Greece the conqueror of Persia under Alexander and made Rome supreme for three centuries over the wild tribes of Germany and Africa; but in the Roman Empire, as in Asia, the turn of the barbarians to conquer civilization came in due course. A skin-clad savage from the Baltic, scarcely different from one of our own Iroquois of the last century, took place in Rome of the last Cæsar. A band of Turkoman shepherds from the steppes of Tartary have for four centuries occupied the imperial city of Constantine. One cannot see grounds for the assurance that similar changes are now impossible.

The material power of the European race was concentrated in the Roman Empire as it has never been concentrated since. It represented the highest civilization and culture as well as the greatest military power of the world for nearly six hundred years. If independent nations or tribes continued to exist around its frontiers, it was only because the domestic policy of the Roman Government desired no further territory. From Marius to Theodosius no rival State rose to dispute the supremacy of the Roman. One government ruled France, Spain, Great Britain, West Germany, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, Turkey, South Russia and the whole north of Africa. In all these lands there were no more national rivalries than exist among the different States of the American Union to-day. Roman law and Roman language, Roman schools and Roman military discipline were the common possession of York and Alexandria, of Morocco and Cologne. The tribes outside her borders were scarcely more important than the Creeks or Shawnees to the Republic of Washington. The Parthians of the East were not more formidable than Afghanistan to-day is to the

Indian Empire, and the known world showed no other power even the equal of Parthia in military strength. A Roman of the days of Constantine might, not unreasonably, hold the supremacy of his race and civilization was a natural law of human nature. He could look back four hundred years to Sylla and Marius and find Rome, even then, dominant over all rivals and already old in a career of victory over Greek and Carthaginian, over Gauls and Asiatic monarchs. Compared with such a duration, what have any of the civilized powers of our time to show? Russia as a European power only begins with the eighteenth century. The whole foreign Empire of England is no older. The French Republic, by the widest reckoning, cannot date beyond the Revolution. Austria began with the nineteenth century in her present form. The German Empire and the Italian Kingdom have each but thirty years' existence. Our own United States has a hundred and eleven years of its present Constitution. Judged by the test of time, the present predominance of the European race in the world is almost as brief in comparison with the Empire of the Cæsars as the dominion of Napoleon in France beside the old Bourbon monarchy. Yet Rome crumbled and her Empire passed away within a half a century of the death of Theodosius. A savage chief ruled in the Imperial City as its King before the end of the fifth century, and other hordes divided the provinces of the civilized world at will. Neither higher civilization nor military science could preserve the European race from foreign conquest fourteen hundred years ago. They hardly promise better guarantees to it to-day from the successes of three centuries.

The collapse of the Western Empire was mainly a triumph of barbarian over civilized man among European races. Goths and Vandals, Burgundians and Lombards were of the same Caucasian race as Romans, Greeks or Celts. But the revolution then begun did not end with the substitution of Frank or Gothic Kingdoms for Roman Cæsars and prefects. From the deserts of Arabia a power was developed by Mahometanism which, within sixty years, conquered the largest half of the territory of European civilization and held it for fully a thousand years under various forms. The Arab Caliphs made the whole of Roman Africa and Western Asia as well as Spain and Sicily part of their empire, which for two centuries was the greatest in the world. When the Saracen power crumbled its place was taken by other Asiatic conquerors, Turk or Mongol, with undiminished power. From the eighth to the fifteenth century the domain of the European races was steadily diminished by the tide of Asiatic conquest. Christian Russia became a province of the Mongol Khans in the twelfth century. The Balkan Peninsula fell under the rule of the Osmanli in the fifteenth. In the sixteenth century Sultan Solyman was the foremost ruler in Europe, and up to 1683 no Christian land, once conquered, had ever been recovered from Turkish rule. The Russian Czars paid regular tribute to the Khan of the Crimea, himself but a vassal of the Sultan. Indeed, it is barely a hundred years since our own United States paid a tribute of sixty thousand dollars annually to the Dey of Algiers to escape the seizure of American vessels by the Algerine Corsairs. European ascendancy seems rather too recent a growth to warrant assured confidence in its permanence even now. Mahometanism had nine hundred years of victory and ever growing territory before her decline came.

Civilization is an elastic term and very differently understood by different races. The Chinese are as fully convinced of the superiority of their own institutions and culture as the most enthusiastic Anglo-Saxon or German Imperialists of their own call to take up the "white man's burthen." It must be admitted they are not wholly without justification in their ideas. The population maintained by the soil of China is denser than that of Europe and equals the wealthiest individual European countries in that respect. The political convulsions of the last fifteen hundred years have been far more destructive of human life and material progress in Europe than in China. Wars of conquest have been, as a general rule, avoided by successive Chinese Governments during all that time in spite of the preponderating power placed in their hands. The action of the Emperors of China towards their weaker neighbors of kindred races, towards Annam, Corea, Burmah and Japan has been more equitable on the whole than that of any great European power during the last three centuries. The government, however corrupt, is one of law rather than brute force, and the length of its duration is a fair argument that the good in the system outweighs the evil. In spite of the denser population in China, the material comfort of the people is greater than in India under Anglo-Saxon rule. Famine, though not unknown, does not recur with the terrible regularity of its appearance in British India, and has never, we believe, attained the intensity of the Irish famine of 1848 under the present Queen's reign. Neither is the public action of the Chinese authorities marked with the cynical disregard of human suffering that has been too often expressed by European rulers, and in theory, at least, the obligations of the rulers towards the people are fairly recognized in China.

In some points we cannot but notice that the Western nations have been adopting as social improvements institutions in vogue for over a thousand years in the Chinese Government. During the nineteenth century the growth of democracy has been one of the most marked movements in European civilization. In China there is no privileged class of nobles. The offices of government are filled by examinations almost on the principles known in this country as Civil Service Reform. With all its materialism, the Chinese race has a high regard for intellectual culture, and the tests applied for its recognition are not widely different from those of European schools and colleges. This must, in fairness, be considered in deciding on the real human value of the Chinese system of civilization. That it is imperfect, that the laws are not formed on European models or always honestly administered may be conceded without therefore concluding the whole system unfit for existence. We are not confident that the general administration of the laws in our or any other land is above reproach, or that any of our systems of government does not need improvement, yet we claim the title of civilized men. We may grant as much to the Chinese.

With all its jealousy of foreigners it is but fair to admit that during the last three centuries the Chinese Government has treated the Catholic missionaries and their converts with less intolerance than most non-Catholic European States. The year in which the first Jesuit missioner entered China was marked in England by the execution of Father Cuthbert Mayne with worse than Asiatic tortures on the sole charge of being a Catholic priest. In 1599 the Italian Jesuit, Ricci, was allowed to settle in peace at the Chinese capital and teach his religion to any who chose to hear him. During those seventeen years nearly two hundred persons, priests and laymen, had perished on English scaffolds for profession of the Catholic Faith. A Chinese Christian was first Minister of the Emperor.

At this time, in Sweden, profession of Catholicity was a capital offense, as in England was the reception of Catholic orders. The penal codes of both countries lasted for more than a hundred and fifty years later.

There has been a congregation of Catholic Chinese with Bishops and priests and churches and schools in Pekin since the beginning of the seventeenth century, as well as many others through the Empire. The Chinese Christians and their teachers have undoubtedly been often persecuted and many of them executed for their religion by the tribunals, but neither in duration nor violence has Chinese intolerance of Christians equaled English intolerance of Catholics. There have been Catholics in England during the whole existence of the Penal Laws. The year 1583, in which the first Jesuit missioner entered China, was marked in England by the execution of Father Cuthbert Mayne, with atrocious tortures, for the crime of being found in the dominions of Elizabeth as a Catholic priest. At the close of Elizabeth's reign, twenty years later, over two hundred persons, priests and laymen, had been executed for profession of the Catholic faith alone. At the same time a European Jesuit was President of the Board of Mathematics in the capital of China, and congregations of Christians had been formed there and in half a dozen other Chinese cities. Thirty years later a Chinese Catholic, the celebrated Paul Siu, was Grand Colao, or Prime Minister, of the Empire, and two other Catholics were Presidents of Supreme Courts and another Viceroy of Lao Tong. The Jesuit Father Schall was employed during twenty years in revising the Chinese calendar, and on his death an elaborate monument was raised to his memory in the name of the Emperor himself. The Mantchu conquest made no change in the policy of the Chinese Government in this respect. Catholic priests continued to direct the Imperial Academy of Astronomy in the time of Napoleon. In 1811 there were four large Catholic churches in Pekin and over three hundred thousand Catholics scattered through the Empire. The Chinese Christians and their missioners had indeed persecutions to endure from time to time. The Emperor Kea Kin in the present century deported four Bishops and thirty priests to Canton and threatened death to the teachers of Catholicity and exile to its professors. There were numerous local persecutions at different times by Viceroys and Governors as well as outrages by fanatical mobs, but Chinese history shows no such persecutions as marked the annals of Japan in the seventeenth century, or Corea or Annam in our own. The intolerance which makes the abandonment of Mahometanism a capital crime in every Mahometan State finds no parallel in China with all its dislike of foreign ways. Under many of the Emperors Catholic converts attained the highest offices, while in Russia to-day renunciation of the national creed entails perpetual banishment, and in England to the close of the eighteenth century it involved loss of property as well as political rights.

With these facts before us we are not warranted in describing the Chinese as more intolerant in religious matters than Western races have shown themselves to be. The Government is not Christian, but scarcely a Western nation professes to be guided by Christian principles in its policy to-day. The attitude of most of them towards the Catholic Church is scarcely more favorable than that of the Chinese Court, and often far less so. Within the last twenty-five years the Catholics of Germany and Russia were deprived for an indefinite time of all their Bishops, and the exercise of Catholic worship was penal to any priest not licensed by the agents of the Government. If the lives of missionaries and Christian converts have been sacrificed at times by mob violence in China, similar events are not unknown in our own land. The burning of the Ursuline

Convent at Charlestown and the persistent refusal of the authorities of Massachusetts either to compensate for the injury or punish the rioters is as flagrant an instance of lawless brutality as any that can be set against the Chinese Government or people.

The necessity of protecting the different missionaries who are spreading through China in the name of religion is a plea that is sometimes used to justify the aggression of foreign powers. The gross hypocrisy of this motive on the part of infidel governments is too patent. Germany and Russia to-day will not allow a Catholic Jesuit or members of various other Catholic orders even to enter their dominions. With what face can the representatives of these powers demand of China a toleration for foreigners which they refuse not only to foreigners, but to their own subjects? As far as the winning of the Chinese people to Christian belief is concerned, which, after all, is the only motive for true missionary work, this interference of national governments in a work outside their sphere is far more likely to hinder than to further it. From the time of Father Ricci down to a few years ago the Catholic priests, who were the only missioners in the Empire, accepted the chances of toleration or persecution from the Chinese Government. They tried to conciliate the authorities, as the Irish and English Catholics of the last century strove to win toleration from the English Government, but they made no call on their own governments, even when Catholic ones, for protection. Father Perboyre and Father Clet were executed seventy years ago by the Chinese tribunals, but the French Missionary Society made no appeal for reprisal or even protection. It would seem that a continuance of the same course offers the best hope for the conversion of China. If its people refuse Christianity, the loss is their's, but their refusal gives no warrant to Christians to force the Gospel on them at the bayonet's point. Conversion must be free or it is valueless.

Neither morality nor the interests of Christianity call for the violent destruction of the existing Chinese Empire. The material interests of the world at large are scarcely less opposed to such a course. That an enormous disturbance of men's minds and economic conditions must follow is certain. What the result may be, if Asia should be stirred to fighting fury, as France was in the last century by the coalition of monarchs, passes calculation. We can no more foretell it than the Duke of Brunswick could foresee Napoleon and Jena when issuing his Coblentz proclamation to the French people.

That the European troops can put down any armed resistance that the Chinese Government can now offer seems morally certain. Since the first English invasion in 1840 the Chinese soldiery has been almost ludicrously unequal to meeting Europeans in battle, and the late war with Japan showed little comparative advance yet made by them. But that fact does not show that the Chinese are incapable of learning the trade of the modern soldier any more than the others of Western civilization. The long despised Russian peasantry learned to become the foremost troops of Europe in ten years of defeat at the hands of the Swedish Charles. The Chinese may learn similarly, if the system of nagging and aimless warfare is continued indefinitely, or if a skilled head assume efficient control of their government. Asiatic nature is as capable of change and even of sudden revolution as European.

For centuries Japan had been more hostile to European ideas than China itself, while she regarded China as the model nation for government and culture. It is hardly thirty years since the Mikado's government undertook to introduce the science of the West to its people. Yet to-day, in China, the Japanese troops have been recognized as at least the equals of the best soldiers of Europe and America in every military essential. That immobility is not a characteristic of Asiatics is proved by the experience of Japan. There seems no grounds to believe it distinctively Chinese more than Japanese. The population of China is about ten times greater than Japan's. The position Japan, with ten times her actual population, would hold in the world is a suggestive consideration. The population of China equals the whole European race combined. The Asiatic races outside the Empire—Hindoos, Annamites, Siamese, Burmans, Turks, Persians, Arabs and Tartars—make up as large a population as China has. The last forty years have seen projects of German unity and Italian unity realized. Panslavism is being put forward as a more formidable combination for realization in the near future. A union of Asiatic races is not a remote possibility even now. It has been formulated already by Russian public men. Prince Uchtomski, in a recent work published in St. Petersburg, asserts there is scarcely any difference between Siberian and Chinese life, and he adds: "Few Western Europeans have any idea of what the steady advance of Russia across Asia means. We have blended with the Asiatics on the ground of common feelings and common ideas. This accord, on the most vital questions, makes it easy for us to deal with them. We prize absolute monarchy as our greatest treasure, and the peoples of all Asia have the same reverence for its idea. We are true Asiatics to-day."

Russia, in fact, has always been as much Asiatic as European in her national character and policy. "Scratch a Russian and you will find a Tartar" was the old expression of the fact formulated by Napoleon. The original Duchy of Moscow was for two hundred years a tributary of the Khans of the Golden Horde. The Grand Dukes had to journey to Mongolia during that time to receive authority only over their Slavonian subjects. When the Russians shook off their dependence as the Mongolian power broke down, three-fourths of what is now European Russia was occupied by Tartar races. The Finns, who stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea, were the first race amalgamated. The Tartar Kingdoms of Kasan and Astrakhan were conquered in the sixteenth century by John the Terrible, but for a hundred and fifty years later the south of Russia was subject to the Tartars of the Crimea, themselves vassals of Turkey. All these have been long absorbed in the Empire of the Czar, and are officially described as Muscovites, but the Asiatic blood and disposition still remains even among the natives of European Russia.

The Russian advance in Asia has no parallel in the English conquest of India or in the stream of colonization across this continent. It is a combination of both systems. The Tartars of Khiva or Turkestan, the Circassians of the Caucasus, the Kalmucks of Siberia have been conquered, as the Mahrattas were by Wellington or the Sikhs by Gough; but when conquered, they have been enrolled in the ranks of their Russian conquerors on an equal footing. When Skobeleff was marching towards Merv, in Central Asia, twenty years ago, his advance was formed of Mahometan Circassians, who, themselves, had only submitted to Russia twenty years earlier. A few months later Russian troops came into collision with the Afghans at Pendjeh. The general commanding was a Turkoman chief, who, with a commission, had received the Russian name of Alikhanoff. The present Governor of Poland is the Circassian Prince Imeritinski, whose father was an Asiatic chief. A late Chancellor of the Empire and one of the most famous Russian generals veiled their native Armenian names of Melikan and Lazaran under the European forms Melikoff and Lazareff. Men of Asiatic and European origin are mingled in every part of the administration of Russia, and members of the proudest Russian nobility boast of their Tartar blood. Prince Uchtomski's assertion is strictly true. Russia is as much, if not more, Asiatic than European.

What effect the Asiatic feeling of brotherhood will have on the policy of Russia and Japan at the present crisis in China is not to be easily settled. That any prolonged combination of the invading powers will exist seems more than unlikely. Like the confederated monarchs of the coalition against republicanism in France, each is guided solely by private selfish interests, and the result is likely to be the same. Neither France, Italy nor Austria, and still less America, has any prospect of gain from the dismemberment of the empire even could it be effected. The German Emperor's ambition for an empire beyond the sea may lead him to urge war, and even to seize more territory on his own responsibility; but the good-will of his Russian neighbor is too important a factor in his policy to be overlooked. England's military power has been tried to an unexpected length by the resistance of the South African Republics to conquest, and she can afford no army to cope with the problem of an invasion of China. Her power is crippled for the time, as that of Prussia was occupied in the last partition of Poland while Napoleon was forming the armies that a few years later were to lay her prostrate at Jena. In the meantime the continuance of hostilities without definite object or principle of justice threatens serious danger to the world at large. The plunder of Tientsin and Pekin, the atrocities already committed on thousands of unarmed peasants in the pretended interests of civilization have carried modern warfare to the methods of barbarism. At least they give us an idea of the cynical brutality of the work so unctuously styled taking up the "white man's burthen" by the cant of the day.

B. J. CLINCH.

San Francisco, Cal.

THE IRISH POLICY OF CROMWELL AND THE COMMONWEALTH.

FOR practical purposes we might hold that the Republic was merged in Cromwell, but we shall endeavor to take his pretence and the views expressed by all who had taken part in the war against the King and the overturning of the monarchy that the Republic was a real constitution of which Cromwell was at first the most influential military officer and subsequently the supreme Magistrate. The *Intelligencer*, the official or quasi-official organ of the Commonwealth, in its issue announcing that Cromwell was about to lead an army to Ireland, gives a curious challenge to the Marquis of Ormond:[1] "Have at you, my Lord of Ormond; if you cry Cæsar we cry a Republic; at the same time promising that he will have foes to encounter, to defeat whom will be a feather in his cap, and if defeated by them he will sustain no loss of reputation." This is a valuable sidelight in view of the effect aimed at in Carlyle's edition of the "Letters and Speeches of Cromwell." Carlyle wishes it to be understood that the state of things in Ireland defies the human intellect to grasp. Mr. Morley, evidently referring to the passage, observes: "It has been said that no human intellect could make a clear story of the years of triple and fourfold distraction in Ireland from the rebellion of 1641 down to the death of Charles I. Happily it is not necessary for us to attempt the task. Three remarkable figures stand out conspicuously in the chaotic scene." These are Ormond, Owen Roe O'Neil and the nuncio Rinuccini. We think this very disappointing on the part of Mr. Morley, who sees somewhat clearly that the events of that time, the war and the social relations established at that time, constitute the Irish question in its various aspects during two centuries and a half. We are glad to recognize that he looks upon the condition of political and social relations then set up as containing within themselves the elements of disintegration. We go the length of saying that the condition of affairs then brought about in Ireland was an anarchy. We miss from it every element of order and of right. There was not even the "order" that one might expect in a country newly planted with soldiers among the remnant of a people spared to be their servants. Martial law was the criminal jurisprudence, and the civil law—or rather the control of private interests and claims—was in the jurisdiction of commissioners whose statutes and precedents were their own discretion. Such discretion is what a great judge called the law of tyrants.

---

[1] James Butler, twelfth Earl of Ormond, had been raised to a marquisate. Later on he was made a duke.

Beginning the chapter entitled "Cromwell in Ireland," Mr. Morley, we think, very fairly says that it is not enough to describe one who has the work of a statesman to do as "a veritable heaven's messenger clad in thunder." Such descriptions since the publication of Carlyle's biography have been doing their work of steeping intellect and conscience in a kind of lethargy. It is hard to understand how a man so balanced in mind and consistent in principle, to whom difficult problems of government have come for solution and whose maxims of policy approach to the Catholic ethic more nearly than those of any man except his illustrious chief, Mr. Gladstone, would allow himself to sink into the sort of lotos-eater's trance begotten of the strange harmonies and discords of Carlyle. We shall examine the evidence for the events, declining to take the latter's estimate of authorities for the very sufficient reason that he is utterly unable to deal with evidence. Mr. Morley is too gentle in suggesting that this passage or that savors of rhetoric. We say rhetoric, like "the creature wine," is good when not abused, but with Carlyle it does duty for fact, for argument, as well as for morality. In this paper we direct ourselves against Carlyle; for the philosophy of hero-worship in which he finds the rules of conduct for Cromwell and which is the standard by which this atrocity or that is to be vindicated or explained away is the "misbirth" of his own morbid intellect.

Mr. Morley, with an air of criticism, quotes a passage for which we shall find a significant parallel, but the criticism is almost apologetic. He is like an advocate who has the court against him and which he tries to bring round by hesitating insinuation. The court in this instance is the Anglo-Saxon race, or, if you like it better, the English-speaking world. Mr. Morley is an able and honest gentleman, and quotes the following from Carlyle as if there were something in it: "I could long for an Oliver without rhetoric at all; I could long for a Mahomet whose persuasive eloquence with wild flashing heart and scimitar is: 'Wretched mortal, give up that; or by the Eternal, thy Maker and mine, I will kill thee! Thou blasphemous, scandalous Misbirth of Nature, is not even that the kindest thing I can do for thee, if thou repent not and alter in the name of Allah?'" Mr. Morley's censuring this dithyrambic of ferocity is a soft hint that such sonorous oracles do not escape the guilt of rhetoric.

Let it be read in connection with the insane outburst with which Carlyle meets the possible denial of a statement for which he has no authority except Ludlow, whom he himself denounces as a valueless one. The statement in Ludlow's Memoirs that the garrison in Drogheda was mostly English is accepted by Carlyle as "absolutely certain" because it suits him. So he goes on in his superior manner, threatening vague penalties if Irishmen dare to question this absolute certainty: "To our Irish friends we ought to say likewise that this garrison of Tredah consisted in good part of Englishmen. Perfectly certain this; and therefore let 'the bloody hoof of the Saxon' forbear to continue itself on that matter. At its peril!" Then follows something like a promise of a Cromwell visitation. Well, the Irish peasant has a phrase, "The Curse of Cromwell!" in which he concentrates his sense of a calamity beyond the power of language to express. At the thought of it his mind is a blank with regard to all other horrors. The wars of Elizabeth, living in the cold and pitiless pages of Spenser and Carew to chill the heart and appal the mind, have no place in the national memory in the presence of the later horror. Whatever has happened since, the famines of two centuries, by which time can be dated as by Olympiads are shadows, the penal laws are a mere party cry at an election, the land war and the incalculable misery of evictions phases of a social crisis, the dragooning of '97 and '98, in comparison with which the raids of Claverhouse were the sports of children, is only a holiday inspiration; but the Curse of Cromwell is an inheritance of woe to which every child is born in Ireland.

We shall try to give the true aspect of Cromwell and the time;

we shall give it as a protest against the notion that strength, success and wealth are superior to morality; and, above all, we wish to attempt it because the political interests and the reputation of Irishmen are involved in the matter. Were it not for such considerations we should not think of marring the intellectual jubilee of the English-speaking world, synchronizing though it does with a manifestation of imperialism over the grave of Gladstone. It would be impossible to deny to Cromwell some of the qualities which belong to greatness. His rise in life, to which we shall allude by and by, could not have happened without certain moral and mental gifts superior to the common. As surely as Napoleon laid hold of and controlled in his own interests the passions let loose by the French Revolution, so surely has Cromwell seized on and guides those the Great Rebellion unchained in England. But we cannot see in him a commanding intellect entrusted with an eternal mission any more than in Attilla, any more than in those destroying meteors from the East which filled the world for the brief span of a life, leaving nothing behind but blood and ashes. In some sort of way Mr. Carlyle looks upon him as a northern god with the hammer of Thor in his hand. It is true it fell with crushing force on Ireland; it fell on Scotland also. We are very much of opinion that in neither country would he have ground opposition to powder were it not that there were circumstances of fatuity, overwrought zeal, unwisdom and jealousy, which fought as the stars fought against Sisera. In Ireland there was the additional misfortune that at the moment Ormond seemed disposed to honestly avail himself of the military talents of O'Neil, that officer was on his deathbed.

While not agreeing quite with Mr. Morley's opinion of Ormond, we are far from accepting Carlyle's implied judgment that he was not a man whose statements could be relied on. Any statement of bare fact coming from him is trustworthy. He was an honorable man in his way; he was the most splendid gentleman of his time; he had civil talents of a high order, but we think he was totally devoid of military talent. His coming back to Ireland in 1648-9 was unfortunate. His double-dealing had ruined the country; but taking the supreme command as the King's viceroy over men who had so many grounds for distrusting him, and not possessing the training and experience necessary for successful operations against the greatest general produced by the Civil War in England, could have no effect but that of ineffectual resistance to the splendidly appointed army of Cromwell.

We put aside the hazy notions about this struggle which recent writers adopt from the pronouncement of Carlyle already cited in this article. It is so easy to shelter oneself under a plea of the impossibility of unraveling the evil, and by this acquiring the privilege of ventilating theories and inventing facts, that writers of a certain kind are tempted to pursue that course. Your mind is the mill and your inner consciousness the tender of the raw material. The fact is the vast information to be had from Carte's "Life of James Duke of Ormond" would of itself enable one to follow the whole war in Ireland from 1641—Mr. Morley's figure—until its termination in 1653. Carte, who is by no means friendly to the old Irish, who for that matter looks at everything with the eyes of Ormond, is described by Carlyle as "Jacobite Carte." Why? Simply because he puts the deeds of Cromwell in their genuine colors. It must be recollected that we are Christian men, now judging men brought up in a Christian land, who executed the dictates of a policy of extermination two centuries and a half ago on a people professing the Christian religion and who were not one whit less civilized than their fellow-subjects in England. We mentioned Ormond. Take him as a representative of the nobility of the Pale. All the praise Mr. Morley can give his statesmanship and character we can give to his externals—to whatever comes under the head of manner and equipage and to his character in those passages where his idolatrous king-cult did not interfere to warp his judgment. In his progresses from his seats to Dublin Castle six carriages and six accompanied him, and with these an escort of gentlemen of his own name, a dozen servants out of livery belonging to good families, a little army of servants in livery. His valet had orders to lay out a fresh suit of silk or velvet each day. This was when he was a young man in Ireland. Very little after he was the greatest figure at Whitehall. When we have him in 1649 he was a pauper, but with the thirty pistoles he brought from the Continent as his military chest he did not despair of his master's cause.

Take a representative of the old Milesian nobility. The Earl of Thomond's state was hardly in any respect inferior to Ormond's. We have the authority of a foreigner for the statement that his parks, gardens, castles and so on were not surpassed in Europe. He speaks of one deer park as containing three thousand head, we think in 1646, when the pinch of the long war must have been sharply felt by men in all conditions of life. Thomond was a colorless sort of magnifico, unable to take sides either with the Confederate Catholics or with the King, but that he was a great prince there can be no doubt, if for no other reason, because his terrible Protestant kinsman, Murrough of the Burnings, who looked up to no one else, looked up to him. If one reads the accounts of the proceedings at Kilkenny he can only arrive at one conclusion, that the Catholic lords and commons and the Catholic bishops assembled there were able and educated gentlemen with a high sense of public duty and a conception of political morality rare not merely then, but which is now to be found only in a few instances in Britain—in Mr. Morley himself and, much as we differ from him, in Mr. Arthur Balfour and one or two more. Now we submit that the slaughtering of men of this kind[2] and the transplanting of them with adjuncts of incredible suffering, the shipping them off to the Barbadoes, the extremes of military violence offered to their wives or sisters or daughters, sons, children of all ages, even to the infants, "lest nits should become lice," we submit deeds of this kind must be judged not as though Cromwell were a Mahomet ranting at "scandalous Misbirths of Nature," but as an Englishman of the seventeenth century exercising unlimited power over the lives and fortunes of his countrymen.

There is too much of this factitious use of measures, this history-book handicapping of men, principles and events. Why should James of Ormond be declared "incapable of pardon," though he was a Protestant? Why the Lord Primate Bramhall? Why should every Protestant bishop, dean, archdeacon and dignitary? Mr. Morley does not seem to have reflected on these points, though we admit his principles of toleration compel him to condemn Cromwell's murdering of Irish priests and friars, and he does so on the same ground as he would the killing of Protestants by Catholic authorities. But the omission of this feature in the tyranny of the Commonwealth or its agent or master, Cromwell, is unfair. The ferocity of Cromwell was an ingrained or inborn instinct to which the gloomy fanaticism of his sect, fed on the bloody commands and examples of the Old Testament, gave a half-believed-in, half-doubted-of sanction. The inexorable and scheming policy wrought out in the death of Charles I. is in its own chamber of psychological study a crime portentous like the massacre in Drogheda. The point we have in view is that there is an abnormal cruelty like Cromwell's, or like that of the more desperate Cameronians, which, while seemingly tinged with insanity, is the instinct of a savage egotism. There was something of it in Napoleon's shooting of the Duc d'Enghien in the fosse of Vincennes, a great deal of it in the murders of the best and noblest in Rome by those emperors who are the fables of history. The persons in whose blood others would shrink from imbruing their hands would be the selection of those egotists. Now like to that eclecticism in morbid ferocity we hold is Cromwell's universal, indiscriminate massacre of soldiers in cold blood and non-combatants without regard to age or sex. It is a ferocious vanity.

Accordingly, we are disposed to regard the "veritable Heaven's messenger clad in thunder" as the vulgar and brutal ruffian he was looked upon by his contemporaries, who were certainly as good judges as Carlyle. Is contemporary judgment of no value? If so, the man who struck the most fatal blow at the prestige of royalty was John Hampden—we mean at that sort of glamor which, notwithstanding the conflicts between Charles and his parliaments, made his person sacred almost to the last. Not till the madmen of the Old Testament covenants and sacraments against backsliding Kings and their idolatrous wives became ascendant in the army was there a thought that threatened the life of Charles. The Cavaliers looked upon Hampden's action for years after his death as the line of conduct most disastrous to the monarchy, and yet not one of them during the entire time spoke of him otherwise than in terms of the highest respect. From the day Cromwell first outraged common decency in the House of Commons in a violent rambling invective until the day he slew the King, then all through the usurpation and until his seat went to that son of his whom Macaulay calls a foolish Ishboseth, he was the subject of contemptuous lampoons, the object of nicknames and the scorn and contempt of honorable men. They thought, rightly or wrongly, at the Restoration that the only way some atonement could be made to justice outraged, loyalty made a crime, antiquity dishonored and King, Church and State trampled under the feet of lawlessness and irreligion was by gibbeting the remains of the principal delinquent. It was an indescribably weak and contemptible act, but it helps our judgment that this Carlylean demigod was after all only a badly moulded image of brass with feet of clay.

---

[2] Knocking on the head is Cromwell's own phrase.

We shall proceed now, as far as our limits will permit, to correct the historical distortion by which Carlyle makes State papers, contemporary documents of all kinds, the consensus of opinion to his own time an elaborate lie and his imagination the source of truth. Certain French publicists in what they regarded as the reactionary day of Charles X. began to discover in the great English Rebellion, of which the presiding genius was Cromwell, that movement of constitutional aspirations and needs in which their own Revolution was conceived. But not until Carlyle said the word did the historical or political philosophy of Britain regard him as one of the lights of progress. To examine his claim to the title of a benefactor of his kind a slight glance at his early history may be of advantage. He was when a young man reckless, violent and dissipated. It is unnecessary to repeat the things told of him on the Cavalier side. He became a bankrupt in business, and then turned to religion, assuming the severest pharasaism of the Puritans. He entered Parliament, and in one or two speeches justified the hopes of his constituents that no law, no respect for usage, no regard for the religion of the State would restrain him in the expression of their sentiments. Certainly some very strange persons were sent to the Long Parliament in that swing of the political pendulum which carried hot-headed and unreasoning men to the extreme from the monarchical principle. Events came to a crisis; the prospect of civil war was close at hand.

Charles directed that the Irish would recall some regiments that had been disbanded, enroll new regiments, reform their own Parliament and provide for the redress of the grievances concerning which they had been for a long time in treaty with him and for which they had paid him an enormous sum of money. This is the true statement of the origin of what Mr. Morley describes as "the savage aboriginal frenzy of the Irish." The movement was to be kept a secret, but one whose name has had hard measure in the unfair histories of the time became acquainted with it. This is Sir Phelim O'Neil. He was a member of the bar and of Parliament, a man of large estate and had been educated, if we mistake not, a Protestant by the Court of Wards. Some of his followers heard of the King's designs, communicated them, and all who received the intelligence felt that they were likely to serve their own, their master's interests and the King's. They rose up to recover possession of their lands, and it is plain as anything can be that the settlers fled for the most part, and none were slain unless those who offered resistance.[3] The government of the Lord Justices was in a panic in proportion to the terrible cruelties it had been exercising all over the country and even in the districts around Dublin. Though these officials had been appointed on the King's behalf as representing his viceroy, they were employing his troops in the service of the Parliament, torturing loyal gentlemen in the chamber of the Castle and murdering or otherwise harassing their tenants. In point of fact, it was at this time from the Council Chamber the secret leaked out that the Catholic religion was to be suppressed and the Catholic proprietors transported to the North American settlements; and this was to be done irrespective of descent. The knowledge of the design more than anything else forced the Catholics of the Pale into an alliance with their co-religionists. If they had no such fear we are very clearly of opinion they would be as ready to hunt down the old Irish and their clansmen as were their fathers or grandfathers under Carew and Mountjoy in the reign of Elizabeth. Recovering from the panic the Lord Justices directed measures of appalling vengeance against the insurgents. For these, as was only natural, there were deeds of a like character committed in retaliation. The outbreak was put down. Not for three years after was there an attempt to make a charge of general massacre. There was nothing of the kind hinted in the reports of the Irish government to the Parliament, but about the year 1644 Temple compiled for purposes of State the invention that three hundred thousand Protestants were massacred in cold blood "or otherwise" during the insurrection in Ulster.

---

[3] The case of Lord Caulfield is the strong one against O'Neil. Caulfield was shot without his knowledge. If O'Neil were guilty, why was he offered pardon by the Parliament in 1649?

We fully recognize the sharp line of distinction between the action of the Confederate Catholics and the abortive outbreak in Ulster. That the insurgents engaged in that enterprise were disavowed by the virtual Parliament of the Kingdom of Ireland, we mean the Confederation, proves nothing more than the severe and jealous judgment of men of high rank on the proceedings of peasants under dispossessed and factious leaders acting without authority. The use made of the outbreak in England, the declared purpose of the King that he would go to Ireland to put it down,[4] clearly proved to the Confederates that their policy should be one guided by prudence, resting on sound principles, in accordance with public usages and in support of the institutions of the kingdom. That Sir Phelim O'Neil was not believed to be the sanguinary ruffian the Parliament authorities depict him is clear from the fact that he was one of the Commons in the Confederation, and a little after he was married to a daughter of General Preston, who possessed his own share of the Norman's pride.

The war which the Confederation began early in 1642 was carried on with varying fortune and under unfortunately divided counsels until the death of the King forced Ormond to see what he ought to have seen at first, that these men had other interests in the struggle as well as the reëstablishment of the royal authority. Owing to Ormond's intrigues and his influence with the section of the Confederates belonging to the Pale, Preston spent his time moving about Leinster, Castlehaven levying contributions and fox hunting here and there through two provinces, Clanrickarde for the King practically helping the Parliamentary generals in Connaught, Murrough of the Burnings sometimes striking effectual blows for the Parliament all through Munster and in the adjoining parts of the other provinces, while Monroe with a large army of veteran Scotch was living on the people of Ulster until his power was broken at Benburb by Owen Roe O'Neil. For this playing at cross purposes Ormond is responsible; and Mr. Morley, as well as Irish Catholics of literary mark and historical acumen, are clearly and distinctly wrong in attributing to him statesmanship much higher than the routine experience of Dublin Castle.

---

[4] It was proved by the Marquis of Antrim that he and others were commissioned by the King to effect the diversion we mentioned, but it was foiled by the leaking out of the secret.

However, the period is clear enough to our view and the men who adorned and darkened it. Certainly Cromwell does not come out of a mystery, out of the twilight of history, however skilfully Carlyle weaves his cloud and casts his shadows. In the turmoil of civil war the crazy member of Parliament,[5] the bankrupt brewer or butcher of Huntingdon or both might find himself at the top. In the turning of the world upside down he would be like the lawless raiders of the Border, who were best served, to use their expression, when the underside was uppermost. It is in vain Carlyle tells us, or in vain Mr. Morley seems to agree with him, that no one can understand the political and social circumstances and interests from 1642 to the landing of Cromwell. They are unhappily plain enough and have their counterparts in the story of the unhappy land. Ever and ever, even at this writing, in a small way, we find the jealous, the ambitious, the covetous endeavoring to defeat the work of reconciliation. There have been men so saddened from age to age that they bowed their heads in despair, smitten by a sense that a hand was against them so strong and pitiless that genius became powerless, devotion an idle sacrifice.

In estimating the year 1649 we do not need the "liquid lightning" in which Carlyle clothes Cromwell to comprehend it. His talk is declamation through a tragic mask, helping the reverberating hollow monotone to the "vague heads" he addresses. There is no sense in the rotund rhapsodical period by means of which he stuns us with "words," "blot," cloud "without a feature" as descriptive terms of the condition of the country when Cromwell for a brief terrible moment rends the veil and shows the heaving billows. The whole is a map easily examined in the authorities of the time; and for the hallucination that has fallen like a spell on so much of the intellect of the United Kingdom and America, Carlyle is the archimage accountable.

There is something attractive in a theory, even though untenable, under which we are invited to look at an historic personage in a new aspect. We do not think a more financially successful book could appear than one aiming with ability and art at the reversal of the verdict of history. Indubitably circumstances favored the solemn, tragic and quasi-mythical treatment employed by Carlyle. Cromwell, without undue exaggeration, could be puffed up into a Hebrew judge commissioned like Josue to conquer the land flowing with milk and honey promised for an inheritance. There would be a rough force about such a parallelism to which the Biblical turn of your common Englishman and your middle class Englishman would go forth. This investiture, familiar as the Sunday clothes in the meeting house, would make him a tutelary power in the Nonconformist household, by which political and religious problems would find a more apt solution, a more worldly or wide-awake one than the remote dreaminess which carries the Scotchman past the remnant on the hillside, past the first Reformers, past Apostles, past all to the Theocracy. Incidentally we have but the radical difference between the English and Scotch sectary, and we only hope that the Liberals of Scotland will never entertain the idea that the man whose hand was so heavy on their country could have been a friend of liberty any more than the first Edward, who brought them "chains and slavery."

---

[5] He was regarded by the Court party and the bulk of the opposition as a vulgar, irresponsible fanatic, without the power of speaking coherently.

But a Biblical hero was too closely human, too much within the measure of mankind, despite his inspirations and enthusiasms; so we must take a flight to the desert with Carlyle, a hegira, for a new creed; and then to the thunderous mountain walkers of the North, gods of the ice floe and the regions of the mist. To such a conception Cromwell bears as much resemblance as the King in a play does to a real potentate prescinding from the sentiments which in the player King are often very genuine. Or, better still, he is as like the compound of prophet-sheik, Hebrew Judge and heathen world-crusher as any strong-willed, huge-nosed Anglo-Saxon of to-day might be to Osiris blended with Apollo. We must come down from the fantastic world in which Carlyle has placed Cromwell to say that nearly two centuries of political and social degradation loaded the English laborer with a weight unmatched in France from the time La Bruyere gave his picture of the peasant until the latter echoed the cry of barricades bursting from ensanguined towns; and this burden the English laborer owed to Cromwell and the Commonwealth.

The reaction from their tyranny is to be measured by the frenzy of delight with which the people hailed the Restoration. They went into the opposite extreme of surrendering every right of freemen to the Crown, the landed interest and the Church. The enslavement of the laborer, the extinction of the small proprietor and the yeoman followed. Englishmen, with a curious inconsistency and injustice, were determined to efface all the marks of Cromwell's despotism in England and to maintain in their integrity all its marks in Ireland.

The ghastly, immoral and bewildering theories of Carlyle are presented in the language of a morbid conceit qualified by art. They antedate the facts which are to verify them and are in harmony with the facts when these are submitted to refinement in the alchemy of his mind. That Cromwell, like Frederick, should be the man of his time, he is fashioned, as we have seen, into one clothed with a divine mission. Ambition, hypocrisy and cruelty are transformed into public spirit, prudence and sagacity.

A hundred Irish women are butchered after the battle of Naseby. Mr. Carlyle tells us: "There were taken here a good few 'ladies of quality in carriages' and above a hundred Irish ladies not of quality, tattery camp followers with long skean knives about a foot in length, upon whom I fear the ordinance against Papists pressed hard this day." It will scarcely be believed that there is no authority for the statement that these poor creatures had knives. The whole passage with regard to the Irish women is unfair and the excuse suggested for the butchery is untrue. In the first place there were Irish ladies of quality, wives of officers, among those slain; the others were the wives of the private soldiers. Schomberg, forty years later, speaking of the custom of the Irish soldiers in taking their wives and infants with them, remarked it had in it more of love than policy, a different conception from Carlyle's.

The ordinance referred to was a decree of the Parliament commanding the murder of Irish Papists taken in arms anywhere in England. A similar enactment was made by the Scotch and faithfully executed; in fact, there was an agreement to that effect between the Scotch and their English allies, but the effect of the ordinance was sadly blunted when Prince Rupert began to shoot Parliamentary prisoners for every Irishman killed in cold blood. So much for the divine character of the ordinance against Irish Papists. Now, at the end of two centuries and a half, we must confess that among the many errors of the Confederate Catholics not the least impolitic was their allowing the rules of civilized war to foes who spared neither the prisoner taken in battle nor the peaceful inhabitants of the country. The terrible game of reprisal could alone appeal to men who set no measure to their ferocity except the sense of their own safety.

The Confederates had overwhelming proofs that the extirpation of their religion was the aim of the English Parliament and its officers in Ireland. It is idle for Carlyle to deny that a policy of extermination had been determined on, or suggest it as an invention of Clarendon's, the man least likely of any in England to trouble himself with the making of a fiction which might be injurious to the Cromwellian Settlement in Ireland, which he regarded with the fullest approval and to maintain which he employed his influence and counsel as the first Minister of Charles II. It is impossible to understand Carlyle's language with regard to Clarendon in this instance. He handles the point of extermination in this way: "There goes a wild story which owes its first place in history to Clarendon, I think, who is the author of many such: How the Parliament at one time had decided to 'exterminate' all the Irish population; and then finding this would not answer had contented itself with packing them all into the province of Connaught, there to live upon the moor lands; and so had pacified the sister island." One without very much difficulty can trace the operation of Carlyle's mind through this passage, the appearance of caution in "I think," and so forth, the sneer at Clarendon as a person easily imposed on or ready to invent or give currency to all manner of tales damaging to the Commonwealth. But he warms to the work and so the authorship, the creation is fastened on Clarendon by a method which if it be generally imitated will put an end to history. He says: "My Lord had the story all his own way for about a hundred and fifty years, and during that time has set afloat through vague heads (sic) a great many things."

We have no exceptional admiration for Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, but we shall cite one or two passages from Macaulay's "History of England," in which the apologist for the great Rebellion as well as the Revolution of 1688, presents his estimate of Hyde: "He had during the first year of the Long Parliament been honorably distinguished among the Senators who had labored to redress the grievances of the nation. . . . When the great schism took place, when the reforming party and the conservative party appeared marshaled against each other, he with many wise and good men took the conservative side. . . . It must be added that he had a strong sense of moral and religious obligation. . . . But his temper was sour, arrogant and impatient of opposition." We submit this judgment of Hyde's character and disposition would be sufficient to dispose of Carlyle's "I think" mounting up the steps of possibility to certainty; but the policy of extermination was so much and so absolutely one of the commonplaces of the time and the failure of it so conspicuously due to circumstances too strong for the actors that one wonders how it could be questioned. The courage of Carlyle is undeniable.

The fact is that the money obtained for the prosecution of the war in Ireland from the beginning of the troubles with the King was advanced by a number of persons called adventurers, who received in return debentures on the estates to be confiscated. There were several loans of the kind and distinctly recognized classes of adventurers according to priority. To these were added the officers and soldiers, to whom had been given debentures on Irish land for their arrears of pay. Lord Clare, in his most remarkable speech in 1800 in support of the Union, stated that almost the entire soil of the country then changed hands and was parceled out among the representatives of the "two hundred or more sects" which "then infested England." But we clinch the argument by saying Cromwell was himself one of the deputation from Parliament in 1649 to the Guildhall to ask for an additional loan. In answer to the question in what manner the war was to be carried out, the Chief Baron Wild replied to the city authorities: "It will be by rooting out the Papists from the land and planting it with Protestants." Either Carlyle was culpably ignorant of this or he more culpably suppressed the knowledge of it and rode off on his imaginary combat in the lists with Clarendon. He himself supplies evidence enough that Cromwell went out with a mission of punishment, of revenge which should be ample and monumental. In fact, in his speech to the soldiers at Dublin a few days after landing he said that they were to war upon the Canaanites, and as the people of God warred for the promised land and against idolatry, they were to carry on the war in the country to which they had come.

Cromwell entered on his work in a way that deserved success if there were no God, no moral government of the world. Within two days after he sailed he cast anchor in Dublin Bay. Dublin had been surrendered to the Parliament by Ormond rather than that it should fall into the hands of the Confederates, whom he was now leading against Cromwell. It served as a base for the latter, who set out for Drogheda with a splendidly appointed army of twelve thousand men over and above the forces under the other Parliamentary generals in Ireland, and who might be trusted to watch the Irish armies scattered through the provinces. The fleet of ninety-two vessels sailed along the coast in sight of the army. Its business was to maintain supplies and help in the battering of the seaport towns.

On the 3d of September he was before Drogheda. On the 10th a furious cannonade made two breaches in the south wall, wide and practicable as the King's highways. The steeple of St. Mary's on that side of the town had fallen on the 9th. Eight hundred picked troops mounted one of the breaches as a forlorn hope. After a desperate struggle the forlorn hope was flung back on their lines, leaving its colonel dead in the breach. At the third assault Cromwell, at the head of the entire reserve, hurled himself into the breach and forced his way after hard fighting. As the night fell the whole army, horse and foot, were in the streets, the defenders falling back step by step to the Mill mount, where soon a ring of fire and steel girdled them—fully ten thousand men to one-fifth of the number.

It is hardly desirable to proceed further, the particulars are too horrible, and the substance of the defense and subsequent carnage is presented fairly enough by Mr. Morley. One or two incidents we shall note, as they illustrate Carlyle's contempt for evidence which does not suit him; but the considerations that are important in view of the line of defense or palliation taken by the worshipers of Cromwell we must not lose sight of. We have already intimated the value we set upon the plea that his mission and the distance of that primitive age from this can oust the standard of modern ethics from jurisdiction. We say in passing, Mr. Morley is hardly fair in introducing what he calls the "contention,"[6] that the slaughter in Drogheda was no worse than some of the worst acts of those commanders in the Thirty Years' War whose names stand out as by-words of savagery. He admits that such extenuation is dubious. Why, there is no earthly comparison; there is not a common factor between the atrocities in Drogheda and the cruelties inflicted now and then, on one side and the other, during the Thirty Years' War. The acts that stand out as written in crimson letters in that war have been always looked on with horror, and viewed as a warning to Christian men how careful they should be in permitting religion to enter the domain of international policy. But in all these instances the savageries were unpremeditated in a manner—that is to say, they were the result of the brutal passions and utter unrestraint from moral principle which arise during a long continued war. The English army in Spain as late as the nineteenth century went through a carnival fairly diabolical in the sack of Badajos, yet no one would dream of trying the soldiers of the Peninsula in the same court with the God-fearing troops of the Parliament,[7] carrying out the fixed policy of that body and the express commands of their general. It was in no sense of the word military license; it was an indiscriminate fury against the Irish, surpassing that of the Israelites when they entered the Promised Land. It is a problem difficult enough to understand, but there is so much in the history of English warfare resembling it that we must leave the defenders of English aggression to explain the facts. When a people are to be hunted down preparatory to the acquisition of their territory and the confiscation of their property, libels are flung out broadcast. Humanity and the progress of civilization are the excuse for the violation of human and divine laws. The wars of Elizabeth in Ireland, the piracies of the merchant-adventurers in her reign, the conquest of India, the subjugation of Africans are chapters of the policy which asserted itself in the massacre of Drogheda. Such things are done in obedience to a law higher than the rights of weak peoples. This is the explanation, however it may hurt British pharisaism.

---

[6] The exact words are "as is contended." [7] There is one wickedness of which the Parliamentary troops must be acquitted.

The commander at Drogheda, an English Cavalier who had served with distinction in the Thirty Years' War, placed himself at the head of three hundred men on a steep mound after the breach was won. This position is described by Cromwell as "very strong and of difficult access." It could have been taken only at the cost of several hundreds of lives. This was the consideration on which Sir John Aston and his band were induced to surrender on promise of quarter. They were immediately put to death—Aston's body most frightfully hacked—"chopped in pieces," as if the one-legged old Cavalier of Edgehill was the special object of their detestation and vengeance.[8] The subsequent order for the slaughter of the men driven to the northern quarter of the town Cromwell himself palliates as given "in the heat of action." The plea does not hold water. If the Canaanites were to be exterminated, the heat of action was not necessary to justify the divine command. If no Irish were to be spared on account of the Ulster massacre, the heat of action is beside the issue. The truth is that Cromwell did not believe either in the Ulster massacre or the inspiration from on high, but the savage nature of his youth was strong in age. How could he believe in the massacre or the inspiration? He had been in treaty for an alliance with O'Neil, which was broken off on the reappearance of Ormond in Ireland to make that "peace" with the Confederates by which a politic name is given to the union of the purely Royalist and the Catholic interest —a "peace" which his master had desired from the beginning. The steps of the alliance between Cromwell and O'Neil are clear. It is another question how far Cromwell was sincere, but the negotiations had unquestionably reached a definite stage when we find Munroe ordered by the Parliament to supply O'Neil with powder.[9] Now when we remember that O'Neil represented the extreme Catholic interest—what Mr. Morley calls the ultramontane in a connection which shows he has not realized the truly national character of that interest—we can measure pretty accurately the depth of Cromwell's conviction that he was clothed in thunder to destroy the Irish Amorrhite or Misbirth of Nature, or however else his policy may be described in the shifting language of his admirers commenting on his own rather crimson text.

The reality of the belief of a massacre in 1641 and the justice of punishment for it is equally hollow considered side by side with the negotiations mentioned. There are other grounds to establish the fact that however industriously the tale of such a massacre was circulated, there was no one in authority who believed it. The report had served its purpose by throwing the counsels of the King's supporters, Catholic and Royalist, in Ireland into confusion, and by forcing the King into the appearance at least of hostility to his Irish supporters. If an alliance with O'Neil were to be finally effected, the men who invented the report could disavow it and punish their subordinates for libels dangerous to the public interest.

---

[8] Strafford had a high opinion of Aston's qualities as a leader; and as the reader will remember, Strafford himself was one of the first victims of the great Rebellion in England, if not the first. [9] Murrough of the Burnings intercepted the convoy on the way to O'Neil's camp. Murrough was a Royalist at this time.

We can do no better than refer the reader to Mr. Morley's chapter in the June number of the *Century* for some particulars of the sack of Drogheda. Of more importance than the blood-curdling tale is the proof that Carlyle affords, in his account of it, of his inability or unwillingness to abandon a preconceived theory. We have spoken of his insistance in the teeth of evidence that we must hold that the massacred garrison of Drogheda was largely English. Would the reader be surprised to learn that Cromwell gives the list of the regiments defending Drogheda, and they are Irish to a man? The document must have been before Carlyle; it is absurd to suppose a man compiling from the works of the individual whom he is to paint as a more than ordinary hero for the worship of this and future ages could overlook a document in itself interesting and connected with the most severely censured episode of his subject's life. We will not labor this point. The indignation we feel compels us to pass from it; but we see those regiments led by the Norman Irishman of the Pale, by the gentleman of Milesian descent from beyond the Pale; we see the yeoman of Meath or from the meadows of the Upper Liffey fall side by side with the Munster clansman, the clansman from the Celtic parts of Leinster, Sir James Dillon's tenants from Mayo and Roscommon. In the sacrament of blood we witness the single hour of union since the long and desolating war began. We hope from that commingled blood of the two thousand victims on the altar of their country the instinct and the passion of a love may spring that shall yet repair the past.

The "knocking on the head" of the officers who for five days, undaunted by the terrible scenes during the time, defended the two remaining gate towers, is told by Mr. Morley in the graphic words of Cromwell; but there are one or two matters which escape him, and these, in pursuance of our purpose to hold Carlyle up in his genuine colors, we cannot leave aside. The townspeople had taken refuge in St. Peter's Church. The troops enter through window and battered door, each soldier bearing as a buckler an infant on his left arm. Up to the galleries so protected they ascend; having flung the bucklers over the wall, and then goes on the slaying, slaying, matron, maid, old man and youth in one red holocaust.

Carlyle speaks contemptuously of a Captain a Wood, an officer in Ingoldsby's regiment, who was about to take compassion on a young girl, evidently of high rank and great beauty from the description. We do not quite mean that the philosopher of Chelsea finds fault with Wood's weakness, but the story was not worth telling. This is the idea. We shall take the liberty of giving it, premising that Wood was a brother of the great Oxford scholar, Anthony Wood. The latter mentions that it was frequently narrated to the family and among friends by the captain as an experience of the Irish war. We think it too valuable a side-light on the homogeneity of the Biblical religion of the two hundred sects to whom Popery was an idolatrous abomination to be lost sight of.

In the vaults of St. Peter's the rank and fashion of the town sought concealment. When the church was made a shambles, the soldiers descended to the vaults—pike, sword and gun do their work. Among those who were being slaughtered there was a girl, who falls on her knees to Wood. "She was a most handsome virgin, arrayed in costly and gorgeous apparel." With tears and prayers she begged he would save her life. We resume Wood's account: "And being stricken with a profound pity, he took her under his arm, went with her out of the church, with intention to put her over the works to shift for herself; but a soldier perceiving his intentions," thrust his sword through her. This is Anthony's transcript of Thomas a Wood's experience, of whom Carlyle speaks as though he were on terms of domestic intimacy with him, as Tom a Wood, "an old soldier" whose "account of the storm" is "sufficiently emphatic." The account is the most exact of what happened in Drogheda, and the one we have taken in supplementing Mr. Morley; and for the "hacking to pieces" we should have added "chopping to pieces" the body of the governor.[10] Wood winds up the account by letting us see his brother knew, sound Puritan that he was, how the goods of the Canaanites were as the gold and silver of the Egyptians: "Whereupon Mr. Wood, seeing her gasping, took away her money, jewels, etc., and flung her down over the works." There is one circumstance, the particular manner of the slaying of this ill-fated young lady, which cannot be told. We have read accounts of "the Bulgarian atrocities;" and among the vile and hideous methods in which the Turks evinced their contempt and hatred of the slain we could find not an equivalent indeed for the brutalities of the Puritan soldier—or rather for the insane beastliness of his ferocity, but the approach to some resemblance of its turpitude.

We are glad to find that Mr. Morley rejects the plea of success for the policy of terror which Carlyle and those who follow him profess to discover in the sack of Drogheda. No doubt it was intended by Cromwell to have that effect. Ormond in saying he surpassed himself, that he surpassed all who preceded him in the annals of ferocity,[11] adds it was for the purpose of frightening into submission. But a stout, though badly ordered, resistance was maintained., It was not the rending of the darkness by the thunderbolt of Carlyle or Cæsar's "Thrasonical brag" "I came," etc.; it was a war, but one waged with resources, energy and definite purpose against half-starved, badly equipped forces, led aimlessly by two men, one of whom, Castlehaven, had a system unsuited to the country, and the other, Ormond, had no idea of what a system of war meant.

---

[10] We think Astley fought on the Protestant side in the Thirty Years' War—not like Major Dalgetty, who changed sides as often as Murrogh O'Brien in Ireland.

So frightened was Ormond by the story of Drogheda that he ordered Dundalk and Trim to be evacuated. We have in connection with the departure from these towns an insight into the qualities of the Ulster Scotch—they like to be sure of profit. They left the towns unburned in their hurry to get away; they left the cannon behind them in Trim. Up or down the Scotch surrendered Ulster. It is not our way to allow Carlyle, Froude, Macaulay or Hume to make statements or suggest views that are not warranted. Our meaning is that these and other writers assume that all the forces supposed to be acting for the King in the beginning of this year and up to the arrival of Cromwell were still in his service. They were nothing of the kind, and we have a very significant proof of it in a letter by Cromwell to the Speaker Lenthall. When Cromwell landed in Ireland his force between the troops he brought with him and the men already there fighting for the Parliament amounted to seventeen thousand men. The secession of the Ulster Scotch increased it immensely in material and moral power; and we feel bound to say that at this dark period the character of Ormond stands forth in a fine light, superior to fortune like the Roman who never despaired of the Republic. His want of military knowledge he is not to be blamed for, but even now he would not adopt the strategy most likely to embarrass Cromwell, because of a possibility that the Confederate Catholics might treat with him. He is throughout the evil genius of the Irish cause.

As if not satisfied with the terror inspired by Drogheda, Cromwell decided on attempting Wexford. It must be recollected that the province of Ulster was in the hands of his troops and their allies and the country south of the Boyne to Dublin. His fleet was outside; if he proceeded through Wicklow to Wexford, the fleet could attend him and keep up his supplies the whole way. It was well worth his while to go to that town; he had friends there. The Recorder of the town, Hugh Rochfort, formerly "a violent partisan of the Nuncio's,"[12] was in correspondence with Cromwell through Mr. Nicholas Loftus, a man of considerable estate in the county.

---

[11] We wonder had Mr. Morley Ormond's opinion before him when he compared the massacres in Drogheda with acts of savagery on the Continent.

Poor little Moore, who had a warm heart of his own, despite vanities and puerilities, passionately prayed

For a tongue to curse the slave
Whose treason like a deadly blight

defeats the policy and efforts of the patriot planning and fighting for all he holds dear. We know there is no in use cursing traitors any more than in bewailing misfortunes, but in what we write we have a purpose. There are a few objects to be borne in mind which we should like our readers would spell out of this article, not the least of which is the spirituality or idealism, if you like it better, of the Irish race. There is even in this horrible episode of Wexford an instance of high, haughty and fearless rectitude walking the road of honor leading to death with a punctiliousness like knight errantry. What about Carlyle's Old Testament cum Alkoran hero and his "resarted" thunder suit, his profound guile and suspicious watchfulness of the interests of his ambition in England, when compared with the pure motive, the stainless honor which preferred ruin to compromise with suspected or discredited allies? The coarse lineaments of the English middle-class Titan stare in their repulsiveness at us when into the gallery of the mind move Butler and Iveagh[13] and the staunch Catholic townsmen who required a proof of orthodoxy before accepting aid from those who had once wavered or who even now would seem to be within the meaning of Rinuccini's interdict. We need only say that Cromwell may point to the treason of Strafford as freeing him from the obligations of the treaty with the governor of the town. Mr. Morley discusses, as if it were a question of military casuistry, the right to murder the inhabitants of Drogheda; the question here might be how far Cromwell was bound by his own terms to the governor. We do not think where Cromwell is concerned and his soldiers, where the Parliament, the Commonwealth is concerned, that nice questions can be profitably considered. The Irish in not acting like Prince Rupert, or like the Cromwellians themselves, deserved everything that befel them at the hands of those enemies of human right and intercourse. The upshot of it all is that the Wexford people of all ranks became "a prey to the soldiers;"[14] and so universal was the slaughter of them that Cromwell informs the Speaker that not one in twenty of the owners could now claim any property in the town.

---

[12] Carte's "Life of Ormond." [13] Maginnis Lord Iveagh, who led some companies of Ulstermen all the way to Wexford through a country in Cromwell's hands. [14] Cromwell to Speaker.

We do not purpose to notice Carlyle's scoffing at the women murdered at the cross which stood in the middle of the market place. What we shall do is to express regret that an Irish Walter Scott like him who has so finely portrayed the courage and endurance of the Covenanters has not arisen to paint the terrible scene when the women from every part of the town rushed in their despair to the foot of the great stone cross, under the shadow of which they might die in the hope of a happy resurrection, if Christian soldiers would not be moved to pity at sight of the imaged sufferings of the Christ. Such a writer linking the tragedy of the market place to the fortunes of some characters in whom his genius had interested us would describe in plain, unvarnished language—any other would degrade the majesty of truth—the rows kneeling down, becoming rings concentred within rings as the panic-stricken, panting creatures came and threw themselves down—mother and daughter and sister—in agony of expectation as to what awaited, while the work of murder was going on elsewhere. He would tell how from some place where wretches had been forced into the Slaney and drowned, from where boats of fugitives were sunk, from the ramparts out of which leaped other wretches in panic, or from which others still were forced to leap, the wild-eyed, stern enthusiasts came with military precision, armed as strong men with pike and gun and halberd to dc the commanding of the Lord. He would say how a sweet resignation came to the kneeling women when it was their blood only that was required, and that like the martyrs of old a halo was encircling them; or, if any faltered, if human love or weakness cast its shadow over the moment, how the thought passed as Father Raymond Stafford, in his brown habit cinctured by a rope, bareheaded, barefooted, holding the Crucifix on high, stepped into the arena amid the smoke and moans and carnage.

We think we may turn our back on this method of war. Enough has been said to make it incumbent on all who have the slightest interest in the advancement of the Irish race and an honest desire that the claims of the Catholic Church on the English race shall be effectively presented to make a stand against the abuse of the language and the prostitution of the literature to the purpose of maintaining a public lie and of pandering to an insatiable national vanity. Nothing is gained by it. The sense of a pretentious superiority is fed to fatness, the modesty of merit is pushed aside. As we write we hear that the pure sentiment which lent a dignity to Irish literary effort and a self-denial to Irish political life is fading or is being changed into a spirit of cynical enterprise. This is not a desirable prospect.

The policy which imitated the captivities told of in Holy Writ, or the terrible experiments of transplantation when Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian Kings carried off provinces to found settlements in distant regions, failed to darken the spiritual character of the Irish people. It is in danger now from a spurious advancement, a shallow imitation of vulgar materialism. As a protest against this tendency we have spoken these words, told this tale. If we have done it well, we have spoken as we would; if not well, we have spoken as we could.

GEORGE MCDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York.

THE SOURCE OF MORAL OBLIGATIONS.

AMONG the curious phenomena of the revival of classical learning in the fifteenth century may be reckoned the peculiar bitterness with which men of letters conducted their disputes. If a scholar detected his rival in a false quantity he deduced the conclusion that he had likewise violated each of the precepts of the decalogue and was addicted to most of the seven deadly sins. That style of controversy is a thing of the past; and yet when it is not a question of classical learning, but important principles of philosophy that are at stake, the acerbity of the dispute, though veiled, is scarcely less deep-seated than of old. The empiricist suggests that the scholastic philosopher has not altered his point of view since the days of Duns Scotus, and the scholastic hints that empiricists are the enemies of God and man. There is in fact more justification for warmth of feeling where these problems are concerned. They may appear at first sight merely matter for the study and the lecture hall; yet the character of a whole society, a whole nation, is profoundly and rapidly modified according to the doctrine which prevails. What is at first but the teaching of a few professors at the universities is ten years later the common-place of the clubs of the capital, of the daily papers, of the sermons of preachers. Nor do the principles thus adopted remain in the chrysalis condition of speculation. When men have accepted a theory they proceed for good or for evil to reduce it to "crude hard fact" with a logical consistency as relentless as that of a syllogism. Amongst these questions there is perhaps none the current doctrine on which more profoundly influences the national life than that of the authority of conscience. Where men hold that conscience has a right to coerce them their character will in the long run be formed on the principle that duty is the first and imperative rule. Where the coercive power is explained away the claims of duty will fare but ill. That this is so may afford us sufficient justification for an attempt to answer Shylock's question and say why it is that the dictates of conscience *must* be obeyed.

Our own experience is sufficient to show us that the voice of conscience deals with us authoritatively, that when it speaks to us it claims the prerogatives of a supreme power in our regard. Nor is any profound examination required to assure us that it is no artificial creation, but a constitutive part of human nature wherever that nature is not stunted and deformed; that it cannot, as has sometimes been asserted, be explained by the pressure exerted on us by public opinion. The essential characteristic of the obligation which the law of conscience imposes on us is that it is not simply a necessity occasioned by the advisability of avoiding some disagreeable alternative. It is not a contingent, but an absolute necessity. It does not say to us: "If you do not do this it will be the worse for you," but simply and absolutely: "You ought to do this—by the moral law you *must* do it." Nor can its dictates be reduced to the formula, "Do right, or you will violate your human dignity." Were it so its authority would, we fear, have but an insecure foundation. Many a man would be disposed to say, and not without some justification, that poor human dignity had had so many shocks already that one or two more could make but little difference.

What is the explanation of this obligation? Whence comes this "categoric imperative" which deprives me of my liberty, and which if I disobey it, sets me in the position of a criminal before a judge? There is something which takes right conduct from the sphere of the æsthetically correct and the intellectually true, gives it a new complexion and transforms it into something entirely different, namely, bounden duty. The change is so complete that no sense of exaggeration is aroused when the poet personifies Duty and speaks of her as the "stern daughter of the voice of God." This question as to how we are to account for the change from right to duty has with justice been termed the central question of ethical philosophy.

There is a short and easy way of explaining the mysteries presented to our consideration by Nature and by man, which has found vogue at all times and as it seems is not out of fashion yet. It consists in boldly denying the existence of the fact which we are called on to explain. Thus we have seen the mutual interaction of bodies denied by one school of philosophers, the existence of matter by another, the objectivity of space and time by a third, free will by a fourth, the permanence of individual personality by another, and so on. The explanations of moral obligation given us by philosophers of the Hedonistic school are open to this objection. When called on to account for the coerciveness of the dictates of conscience they deny that they possess any. We may illustrate this from Mr. J. S. Mill's treatise on Utilitarianism. The internal sanction of duty lies, he tells us, in "a feeling in our own mind, a pain more or less intense attendant on the violation of duty, which in properly cultivated moral natures rises in the more serious cases into shrinking from it as an impossibility." The origin of this feeling he explains as follows: "Society between equals can only exist on the understanding that the interests of all are to be consulted equally. . . . In this way people grow up unable to conceive as possible a state of total disregard of other people's interests. . . . Not only does all strengthening of social ties and all healthy growth of society give to each individual a stronger personal interest in practically consulting the welfare of others; it also leads him to identify his *feelings* more and more with their good, or at least with an ever-growing practical consideration for it." Such an explanation, though not lacking in ingenuity, is surely only one more illustration of the play of "Hamlet" with the part of the Prince of Denmark omitted. Where, we ask, in all this is there any room for *obligation*, for the factor of coerciveness? Pleasure and pain are one thing; bounden duty is another. Those who confuse them are simply throwing dust in our eyes. Yet here we are taught that the stern voice of duty may be reduced to the prudential dictates of an enlightened self-interest which arise in a "properly cultivated moral nature," and that the imperative commands of the moral law grow out of pleasurable and painful feelings. "Why not then," says a modern critic[1] with justifiable impatience, "sunbeams from cucumbers, or the sense of ethical justice from the varieties of the triangle?"

Not only is there no room for obligation in such a theory, but whereas the law of conscience is a law of right, that of Hedonism, if logically interpreted and consistently followed out, is a principle of the purest selfishness; and this is true even if we concede for a moment that the norm of right action is the greatest happiness of the greatest number. For if the *summum bonum* for each individual is his own greatest happiness no reason can be assigned why conscience should bid him seek the greatest happiness, not of himself, but of others. It is needless to point out that it is a mere sophism to say that because every individual seeks his own greatest happiness, therefore each severally is bound to seek the greatest happiness of all. On the contrary, each on that hypothesis would remain consulting his own interests and putting those of others outside his calculations. So far, then, as a counsel which lacks all obligatory force can be termed a law, the law which Hedonism gives us is merely

---

[1] Mr. W. S. Lilly: "Right and Wrong," page 88.

"The good old rule the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

At the present time, however, it is Mr. Herbert Spencer who, of all the thinkers who place the foundation of morals in utility, exerts the widest influence among English-speaking people. It cannot be said that his writings lie open to the charge of containing this fallacy. He does not tell us that because we each desire our own happiness we are therefore bound to desire something which differs from it so entirely as the greatest happiness of all. The theory of development which holds so large a place in every part of his system supplies him with a convenient solution for the difficulty which is raised by the fact that conscience often bids us act in a way which seems contrary to the principle of expediency. The experience of past time has, he tells us, shown what course of action usually conduces to the welfare of the tribe, and the results of the experience thus accumulated is stored up in our brain tissue, so that we feel disposed to act in a way which would not naturally appear to be the most advantageous in the particular case; to this registered experience is due our innate dislike of lying, stealing and other breaches of the decalogue. We are not concerned here to enquire whether the testimony of facts lends any support to this view, or whether it be mere guesswork, unsupported by adequate evidence. It is sufficient for our purpose that here, too, righteousness, as understood by Mr. Spencer, is merely that which most conduces to the happiness of the tribe, and that, as we have already seen, this leaves the main characteristic of conscience unaccounted for. Moral obligation will not grow out of any number of experiences of the advantageous consequences resulting from an action.

To pass from those writers who base the moral law on considerations of pleasure and pain, and to turn to the theory of Kant is like emerging from the heavy vapors of a marsh into a purer air. That great thinker recognized the authoritative character of the voice of conscience, and made no effort to explain it away. He allowed that it could never be accounted for on any Hedonistic theory, and turned to find its origin in the rational nature of man. Further than this, as it seemed to him, we need not go, for the tendency to prescribe this law is essential to our rational nature. We find the law within us. The categoric imperative of the practical reason which is native to us and is not received as an imposed command from an external source belongs to our dignity as men. In virtue of our free-will, of our power of determining our own conduct, we are capable of obeying these commands or disobeying them, of consulting our human dignity or of treading it underfoot. Hence he taught that morality consists in obedience to these dictates of reason, and that only when we act in accordance with this law, and purely because such is the law, is our action moral.

Yet of the philosophy of Kant no less than of that of the Hedonists we can only say that the obligation it provides us with is a figment. He tells us that we are obliged to obey the commands of reason. But no man can in any true sense impose commands on himself or lie under an obligation to his own higher faculties. We can, in fact, only employ these terms in virtue of a metaphor in which we represent man as divided into two parts, and endow each with some shadow of personality. All the support which the Kantian theory can lend to the law of conscience is to say that if we do not obey it we shall cease to be living as men, and shall become degraded and corrupt. But the individual may answer that after all he is not bound to live the life of an ideal man, and that he entirely declines to be forced to do so against his will. Nor can we make any reply demonstrating that he is under any necessity to do so. This philosophy can, in fact, only give to the moral law a contingent necessity which, as we have seen, differs completely from the absolute necessity that belongs to the dictates of conscience. An absolute necessity admits of no alternative. All material beings save man are guided to their end by the necessity of physical law. Man is guided not by physical law, but by the moral law as revealed in conscience; and since the execution of the moral law is dependent on a free agent we often think of it as possessed of a less absolute necessity than belongs to physical law. We should remember that the moral law never consents to our adopting the alternative of disobedience, whatever be the consequences of obedience to ourselves or others. *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum!* The necessity of the moral law is absolute, only it rules not in the physical, but the moral order. In contrast to this the moral law as set forth by Kant can claim no higher degree of coerciveness than is possessed by a contingent obligation. We must obey it *if* we desire to live as men, *if* we would avoid handing ourselves over as slaves to the cravings of our lower nature. But in all this there is no vestige of real authority, of that categoric imperative which, as he truly tells us, is manifested in the dictates of our practical reason.

The problem, then, which we are called on to solve is to explain how this absolute necessity can arise. And the imposition of an absolute moral necessity as distinguished from one that is purely contingent is not so unknown a circumstance in our ordinary experience that it should be hard for us to find examples and hence to arrive at some conclusions as to the nature of conscience. Let us, for instance, take the case of a child who has been told by his father not to touch some china that lies within his reach. No one, we may presume, will call this a merely contingent necessity and say that all that the command amounts to is that the child must either obey or take the punishment which follows disobedience. On the contrary, all liberty of choice is taken from him. He is under an absolute moral obligation of doing what he has been told, and if he neglects to do so he will have grievously offended against the moral law of childhood. For by virtue of his nature as a child he is totally dependent on his father, the protector and guide, without whose care he would perish. As yet he depends for his existence on the family of which he is a member, and hence he is subject to the head of that family, and may not act contrary to his expressed command. Being in this very real sense one with his parent, he has no more right to disobey him than a member of the body has to disobey the will. If *per impossibile* we suppose the hand to be endowed with sufficient liberty of choice to be able at its own discretion to obey the will or not, it would still be bound to obey it, since it is a part of the same being, and a part which by its very nature is subordinate and dependent. In an analogous way the child is dependent on and bound to obey his father. If he does not do so, he may suffer punishment and so have erred against the Hedonistic code, or he may escape scot free; but most assuredly he is morally blameworthy.

The conclusion to be drawn will now be clear. It is that a moral obligation is found wherever a will to which we are rightfully subject imposes a certain choice on us as a duty. When this is the case our free-will can be bound in the moral order as truly as the processes of growth in a plant are bound and determined in the physical order. Moreover, this relation of dependence on the will of another is very frequent. The members of a corporate body owe this obedience to their head wherever the body is no purely artificial creation, but one whose members are linked together by the operation of the natural law.

All the various forms of dependence which we find thus obtaining between one man and another are only partial. Their sphere may be a wide one, or may be very circumscribed; but in each case there are definite limits which we can assign. There is, however, one relation of dependence which is absolutely unrestricted and of which all these are but reflections. This is the complete dependence by which man is bound to his Creator. Not only do we owe our existence to God, but without His active conservation we should fall back into the nothingness out of which He drew us. He has created us to obey His law, and to that end has put the fundamental principles of the natural law within the knowledge of every rational being. The authority of a father over his son, of a King over his subjects, of a master over his servants are but faint reflections of this primal fountain of authority, the sovereignty of God. Here, then, is the source of moral obligation—in the will of God.

It may, however, be urged, and not without some show of justification, that if obligation is constituted by the expressed will of God, this should be clearly recognizable in the voice of conscience. Yet it is evident that in the greater number of occasions when we act in obedience to duty, we do so without express advertence to a Divine command. But an authority which does not manifest itself in the individual cases of obligation cannot constitute the obligation. Whatever the constituting factor may be we should be able to recognize it in every call of duty.

To this we would reply that though we may not explicitly advert to the fact that the command proceeds from God, yet we cannot but be conscious, and that, too, in each individual case, that the law of duty commands our obedience as something superior to us which is our rightful master and whose claim may not be denied. But a law which is invested with such a supremacy as this, and which can thus demand the obedience of free agents must proceed from a personal lawgiver, and that lawgiver can be no other than our Creator. In other words, it is patent on reflection to all who have the use of reason that to obey conscience is to obey not a mere abstraction—an impersonal rule of conduct—but a personal God. If this conclusion be rejected, it seems scarcely possible to conceive of any other hypothesis on which the facts before us could be adequately explained.

In thus deriving duty from the command of God we do not intend to suggest that the moral law is made known to us in some supernatural way; that conscience is, as it were, something extrinsic—a pressure of the Divine will upon ours, not necessarily belonging to man in his natural state. Such a view would rightly be held to imply that human nature was created imperfect and only able to attain its final end by a special intervention of the Creator. It will be seen on consideration that a creature endowed like man with intelligence and free-will must in the natural order of things be subject to such a law, and be conscious that it is the design of the Creator that he should obey it. The light of reason suffices to show man what actions befit a being such as he is. By its aid he knows that if he is to attain to the highest state of which his human nature is capable the lower appetites must be held in subjection, that they must be checked and controlled by the will; that his faculties must not be allowed to become inert through idleness, but must be developed and cultivated; that as a man amongst other he must be true and just in his dealings; that as a son he stands in a certain relation to his parents, as a citizen to his country, as a father to his children, and that to each of these relations correspond certain actions which befit him. He knows, in fact, the natural law. But he realizes further that he is a creature owing implicit obedience to the will of his Creator, and this shows him that the natural law is imposed on him as a duty. For it would be repugnant to common sense to suppose that the Creator of such a race of beings does not actively desire that their life should be such as befits their nature; to suppose, either, that He is indifferent to their actions, or that He wishes them to be in violation of the nature He has given. True, He has made man's will free. But this cannot obscure the fact that it must be His desire that man should obey those dictates of the natural law which reason makes clear to him; that they come to him as commands and not merely as a course which he may adopt or not as he pleases. There is, then, no need to suppose the existence of some extrinsic monition in order to account for conscience. It is simply reason recognizing the moral law as obligatory on us, and speaking to us of our responsibility in its regard.

From what has been said it is plain in what consists the true malice of the violation of the law of duty. It does not lie in any diminution of the happiness of the greatest number, nor in the retribution which may await the wrongdoer in a future life, nor yet in the confusion and disorder which he introduces into the designs of Providence, but purely in his disobedience. When a child disobeys his parent, or a subordinate defies the orders of a legitimate superior, the two personalities are brought into direct antagonism. Where there was harmony and concord, there is now aversion, and this aversion continues as long as the will of the subject remains in rebellion. The case is similar between God and man; by disobedience to the voice of conscience man averts himself from God, and this alone, apart from all consideration of punishment, renders his act essentially evil.

The distinction between obligation as we have explained it and the sanctions of the moral law should be clearly borne in mind. This is all the more needful since some philosophers appear to hold that the sanctions of the law constitute its obligation. The sanctions of a law are the reward and punishment which follow on our obedience and disobedience to it, respectively. Obligation, as we have seen, is a necessity in the moral order by which a free agent is bound to obey the law; it has nothing to do with the consequences of the action. Those, therefore, who tell us that our every act is caused by a consideration of its results are endeavoring to persuade us that it is invariably the sanctions and not the obligations which form the motives of our action. It is, of course, sufficiently evident that even in this life sanctions are attached to the observance and non-observance of the moral law. These sanctions are, it must be owned, imperfect; and long ago the apparent success which sometimes attends those who set that law at defiance led to the complaint that the wicked "come in no misfortune like other folk." Yet on the whole and in the long run honesty is the best policy, even here. But what we do deny most emphatically is that we must needs act from policy, that there is no such thing as acting purely because we ought, and that the very idea of such action is a mere chimera.

Is there not, however, a sense in which it may be said that our doctrine of obligation only provides us with a new sanction as our motive—a sanction of a more refined kind than pleasure or pain, but nevertheless a mere sanction; and that we have thus only established more firmly the doctrine that there is no obligation which does not spring from this source. It may be said that it is admitted on all hands that no man can act unless with a motive. Some end-in-view there must needs be in every action. Now this end-in-view must be some good to be obtained by the agent; it is not necessary that it should be any mere pleasure; it may consist in the continuance of the due relation between the agent and the Author of the moral law; but some individual good there must be. Analyze, it will be urged, any act said to be done purely from obligation, and you will find that even on your own hypothesis it comes to this: "I obey the law because if I do so I shall be at peace with God, while if I do wrong there will be antagonism between His will and mine. What is this after all but a sanction—an old friend with a new face? You are at bottom acting to obtain a personal reward, nor would it be possible to find any act which in its final resolution is not self-regarding."

Here we have the last word of those who would see selfishness at the root of all human action. It is, so to speak, their last line of defense; but though specious it is not really tenable. For the ultimate end-in-view which man in virtue of his nature tends to aim at is not, as is here suggested, self-advantage. He may, of course, deprave his nature and become entirely self-centred, but in so far as he does so his character is deteriorated and distorted. For in man there is an innate tendency to seek the interests of good for its own sake, and apart from all reference to self. Just as a patriot may forego his own private ends and labor solely for the good of his country, so man tends to forget the advantages which accrue to him from well-doing, and to do right for right's sake. There is a true sense in which each individual is not an independent unit, but a part of a greater whole; for men are not made for solitary, but for social life. And the well-established principle that the parts of an organism tend primarily to promote the good of the whole, and only secondarily to their own good, is no less true of men as members of a body corporate than of the parts of a material body. But man is not only a part of a whole as regards his country, but also as regards the *civitas Dei*. As a created being possessed of the faculty of reason he recognizes himself as a constituent part of that great polity whose head is God and whose other members are his fellow-men, who, like him, are children of God. Hence just as it is natural to a citizen to put his country's interests before his own, so it is natural for man to see in the victory of good over evil—in other words, in the success of God's cause—the great end-in-view of life.

The theory which would make selfishness our motive is further objectionable because it practically denies that actions can have any inherent goodness capable of becoming a motive to our will except such as is derived from their utility to the agent. It tells us that when we imagine we are acting from a sense of obligation we are not obeying the law because obedience itself is intrinsically good, but because it is useful to us. Hence it makes the only true good a subjective state to be attained by the individual. All else it deprives of substantial goodness, only allowing to it such excellence as may belong to it as a means to this. It is, of course, plain that there are many acts which only have a value derived from the result they effect; as, for example, study, which may be pursued for the most worthy or for the most unworthy ends. But there are many actions which are in themselves substantially good; we may instance the internal acts of patience, charity, forgiveness of injuries, divine worship and the like. Anything which is substantially good, of whatever kind its goodness be, is capable of attracting the will and acting on it as a motive, altogether apart from any result to which it may contribute. Were it not so, indeed, the perception of a beautiful scene could never move our will to acts of admiration and love unless it were such as to confer on us some personal advantage. Among acts which thus possess a goodness of their own we may reckon the act of obedience to legitimate authority. It is plain, then, that the moral excellence of acting from a sense of obligation may be a genuine motive, and that we may perform such an act without any reference to our self-interest.

Yet, although it is possible for us to do our duty from no other motive than the cause of right and the service of God, experience tells us that in a vast number of cases it is the reward and the punishment which influence us. To children and to those who are deaf to the voice of virtue as long as her hands are empty, it is the only method of appeal. Indeed, there is no one who does not on many occasions require the props which sanctions afford. The saints, both by example and precept, recommend us to meditate on heaven and hell, and warn us that our perseverance in the way of justice will be very brief unless we do so. Nor is there anything to cause surprise in the fact that much of our right action flows from this source. The task before us is to obey a law which irks and galls our lower inclinations. We are bidden follow the dictates of reason and keep a firm grip on the "demos" of our passions, which are always seething in suppressed revolt. Towards this end we are provided with two great helps. We are able to form habits of self-government which become a second nature to us and tide us over those points where either reason or will is not on the alert; and we are further able to keep our minds fixed on the certain truth that obedience will eventually be rewarded and disobedience sternly punished. Unprovided with these aids our own consciences will tell us how incompetent we should be to support the strain involved in being faithful to the voice of duty.

A moment's consideration will show us how entirely the legitimate self-regard of which we are here speaking—that "calm and reasonable self-love" on which so much stress is laid by Butler in his "Analogy of Religion"—differs from selfishness. An action is positively selfish when we seek some private good, consciously setting aside all consideration as to whether it is right or not, when even though conscience forbid it we determine to pursue our end. Here we explicitly yield to our lower tendencies. There is no resemblance between this and the case where we obey conscience and follow the higher impulses of our nature, but are led to do so by the sanctions attached to the observance of the law. We are not here speaking of the action of a man who is honest simply through fear of the police-constable. In that case it is the external act alone which conforms to the law of right; as far as desire can carry him the man is simply dishonest. We are supposing a case where the man is genuinely honest, not only externally, but internally, but where it is the consideration of heaven and hell that has made him so. It is an absurdity to call this positive selfishness. We have seen that to constitute a positively selfish action a man must determine to pursue his end irrespective of the law of conscience. But no man can say without absurdity: "I am determined to escape hell, and shall continue trying to do so, even if conscience and the law of God forbid me." All that can be said of actions thus motived is that though not positively unselfish, they are self-regarding in such a way as not to interfere with our duty to God, but to aid it. Thus they are legitimate, and even laudable; for when our sense of the inherent goodness and attractiveness of the service of God becomes dulled it is right that we should pursue the blessings which that service brings with it.

We have doubtless against us here the Kantian theory, which will allow the title of moral to no action unless it is not only in accordance with the moral law, but is also done purely for the sake of that law. A right action done for the sake of obedience is, according to this school, simply non-moral. Their point of view is tersely summed up by von Hartmann when he says that it is as absurd to hope to become moral by means of laws prescribed by the reason of another and not our own, as it would be to hope to become fat on meals taken by another person. The root of this doctrine is to be found in their view of man as entirely independent; they do not consider him as a being who by his very nature is dependent on and subject to God. Hence, as we have already explained, they have no satisfactory account to give of obligation which necessarily involves a lawgiver. They are driven to find the lawgiver and the subject in the same person, failing to see that only by a metaphor can a man be said to owe a duty to his higher self. And, further, having lost the clue to the true character of moral action, they have substituted a definition which while it is insufficient on the side of obligation is too strict in regard to the motives which it requires. Their theory, taking no account of the author of the moral law, does not allow them to recognize the provision by which He has assigned sanctions to its observance in order that we may be assisted to neglect the solicitations of our lower nature, and act from motives which though not the highest are nevertheless legitimate. All such actions are placed by them on the same level with those done at the instance of the lower appetites. Such an estimate is evidently erroneous; for if we recognize the call as that of duty, our obedience to it cannot lose its character as a moral act because we are moved to obey by the knowledge that our obedience will be recompensed.

The question to which we have here attempted to provide a satisfactory answer is no matter of merely speculative interest with which the student alone is concerned. We have already called the attention of our readers to the momentous issues with which men's beliefs on this matter are fraught. Who shall estimate the number of those who consciously or unconsciously have taken the doctrines of Mill and Spencer as the principles by which they regulate their lives? Whither such doctrines must infallibly lead we have endeavored to indicate; and the testimony of facts may be invoked to show that what we have said is no more than the truth. Where these views have become popular society is to a large extent frankly pagan, the race for wealth or pleasure absorbs all energies and the authority of conscience is openly denied. It is a prospect well calculated to fill us with apprehension for the future. We all know how clear is the witness of history that the decay of moral principle is the near harbinger of social disruption and national degradation. With the rejection of the authority of conscience is inseparably united the neglect of private duties and a contempt for all obligations towards the nation and its rulers. We are apt to smile at the exaggerated deference paid in old days by subjects to the governing power; perhaps we blame it as servile and inconsistent with the dignity of the individual. A more careful reflection would lead us to recognize that the almost contemptuous disregard which has taken its place is a symptom of far graver import than that extravagant obedience. A firm belief in the authority of conscience, if it could be restored, would be the true cure for these evils. That would not be one of those nostrums on which, under the name of "Morrison's pills," Carlyle has heaped such merited ridicule; but a medicine which would heal society in the only way in which it can be healed, by altering the character of the individuals of whom it is composed.

G. H. Joyce, S. J.

St. Asaph, North Wales.

THE PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVISM.

"Labor is the source of all wealth and all culture, and as useful work in general is possible only through society, so to society—that is to all its members—belongs the entire product of labor by an equal right, to each one according to his reasonable wants—all being bound to work.

"In the existing society the instruments of labor are a monopoly of the capitalist class; the subjection of the working class thus arising is the cause of misery and servitude in every form.

"The emancipation of the working class demands the transformation of the instruments of labor into the common property of society and the coöperative control of the total labor, with application of the product of labor to the common good, and just distribution of the same." *(Opening words of the programme of the united socialistic bodies of Germany, laid down in the congress of Gotha, May, 1875—where the collective principle assumed political importance in the formation of the "Socialistic workingmen's party of Germany.")*

"The economic development of civil society necessarily leads to the destruction of small industries, the basis of which is private ownership of the laborer in the means of production. It divests the laborer of all means of production and transforms him into a penniless proletarian, while the means of production become the sole property of a comparatively small number of capitalists and real estate owners.

"Private property in the means of production, which formerly was a means of securing to the producer the ownership of his produce, has nowadays become a means of dispossessing farmers, laborers and small merchants, and of making the non-laborers—capitalists and landlords—the possessors of the produce of labor. Only the transformation of private capitalistic property in the means of production—*i. e.*, land, mines and mining, raw material, tools, machinery and means of communication—into common property, and the change of private production into socialistic—*i. e.*, production for and through society—can effect that the extensive industry and the ever-increasing productiveness of social labor shall become for the downtrodden classes, instead of a fountain of misery and oppression, a source of the highest prosperity and of universal and harmonious perfection.

"The struggle of labor against capitalistic oppression is necessarily a political one. The laboring class cannot carry on its industrial struggles and develop its economic organization without political rights. It cannot effect the transfer of the means of production into the possession of the body social without possessing itself of political power." *(Extracts from the platform of the socialistic workingmen's party, as adopted at Erfurt in October, 1891.)*

"With the founders of this republic we hold that the true theory of politics is that the machinery of government must be owned and controlled by the whole people; but in the light of our industrial development we hold, furthermore, that the true theory of economics is that the machinery of production must likewise belong to the people in common.

"Resolved, That we call upon the people to organize with a view to the substitution of the coöperative commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war and social disorder. . . . We call upon them to unite with us in a mighty effort to gain by all practicable means the political power." *(Extracts from the Socialistic Labor Party platform, adopted at Chicago, October 12, 1889.)*

"Against such a system (the present despotic system of economics) the Socialist Labor Party once more enters its protest. Once more it reiterates its fundamental declaration that private property in the natural sources of production and in the instruments of labor is the obvious cause of all economic servitude and political dependence.

"We, therefore, call upon the wage workers of the United States and upon all other honest citizens to organize under the banner of the Socialistic Labor Party into a class-conscious body, aware of its rights and determined to conquer them by taking possession of the public powers." *(Extracts from the platform of the Socialist Labor Party, adopted at New York, July 9,* 1896.)

"To unite all persons who are in favor of the coöperative commonwealth as a substitute for the present competitive system." *(Expression of the aim of the Social Democracy of America, at special convention held in Chicago, June, 1897.)*

THE economic question of the hour is the question of paternal government under that form of socialism which is now coming to be denominated Collectivism. This collectivism is something with which every one who by his single vote has a voice in the nation's councils should make himself acquainted. Unfortunately, its fundamental principle is often enough not thoroughly comprehended not only by antagonists, but even by promoters. The socialism which we are asked to understand is not that which was identified with the Reign of Terror or the Commune. It is not the old-time communism or anarchy. It is an economic theory of state polity which has taken its place in the recognized politics of civilized nations, with a seat in imperial parliaments and a regular ticket in municipal elections. It is not a political economy, but an economic polity.

What is this new socialism, this collectivism? Its fundamental principle, with which alone we propose to deal, and which was announced by Karl Marx more than thirty years ago as the one necessary condition for the true economic social reconstruction, is the *abolition of private capital.* By capital we are to understand capital in the active sense, capital that is applied to production. Idle capital which is not applied in any way to bring a return, and which can be used only to be diminished, is not classed as capital to-day. The final object of all collectivism is to do away with private capital as applied to every industry, thus to do away with competition; and to substitute for competition a collective ownership of all the means and instruments of production. Whatsoever is to be employed in production is to be put under official control as a collective capital and is to be common property. Results are to be distributed simply according to the contribution of individual labor which each one makes to the common welfare whilst employing the common instruments upon the common material.

In this collectivism there can be no private enterprise to yield a return in interest, profit or dividend. That is to say, there can be no competition. Hence there can be no private profit, no private agreement upon wages. Employment can be given only by the one absolute monopolist, the entire community. Wages can be only a certificate of the labor that has been contributed. This certificate is to be redeemable in the results of the common production.

Howsoever much we may have hitherto despised this theory, it is time for us to see that it is the tenet of the most widespread political party in the civilized world. It is a party that knows no fatherland, as it knows no mother-tongue. It has cut itself free from all the prejudices of language and of traditional methods in government. It is even strong enough to-day to concentrate its forces in some constitutional, elective community, and by a single majority-ballot to take possession of the machinery of government.

The final, adequate end, namely, absolute common ownership, is not stated in its fulness and simplicity in the socialist, collectivist platforms drawn up at the time of municipal and general elections. The collectivism advocated in these programmes is usually limited to those industries where capital has already become sufficiently centralized to manifest the tyranny of monopoly and where the centralization is sufficiently organized to make the transfer to public control an affair of merely passing a law, signing a paper and paying a price. We are not considering here the advantages or disadvantages of *certain* municipal ownerships, as of water, lighting and passenger transport; or of *certain* national ownerships, as of railways, telegraph lines, etc. We are occupied solely with the question of ultimate complete centralization, the abolition of private capital and the common ownership of *all* the means and instruments of production. The tendency of the broad socialistic movement is to *this*, as to an ideal, a goal. We are told that it is only by an ultimate reconstruction of society upon the basis of common ownership that all men will be enabled to receive a wage commensurate with their labor, a compensation due to them for the benefit which by their labor they bestow upon the community. It is seriously important, therefore, to understand at the beginning and to bear constantly in mind that in dealing with the collectivist theory we are dealing with a political theory of *labor* and not with a theory of idleness, anarchy, nihilism, dynamite or free plunder.

In face of this latest scheme for the amelioration of the condition of labor, all the old systems for the reconstruction of society, the systems of St. Simon, of Fourier, etc., have passed into the history of theory. The new system itself is far from being clear, whether as to the details of method or of practically distributed results. However, its fundamental principle, the consolidation and common ownership of all the means and instruments of production, is clearly and unmistakably announced. This principle, at least in partial expression, is found embodied as a political tenet in every socialistic programme that is presented to the people for their suffrage. It is the one point which is found in every socialistic programme without exception. And what is significant of its silent power is that it is recognized by governments the most antagonistic to it as a policy which may be legitimately presented to the people for their election.

In the collectivist theory, then, the one sole cause of all the difficulties with which labor has to contend is free competition in production. This affects everything—the stocking of the market, the wages paid, the price. The wage-earner is at the mercy of the competing capitalist producers. Take away the one cause of the difficulties, take away competition, and the labor question is solved. The only way to be rid of competition is to have no competitors. The only way to be rid of competitors is to have but one producer. The only way to have but one producer is to make all the means and instruments of production absolutely common property and to prohibit all private production for profit or sale.

This collectivism has entered into the field to win not by violence, but by the present conventional political means, that is to say by a majority of votes. Though collectivists feel that just now they cannot get this majority for the establishment of the social state, yet they are sanguine of ultimate success. They rely upon the enemy as their best ally in the destruction of the enemy. Under the conditions of industry which have been brought about by machinery and rapid transport they are waiting for the competitive system to run its course. Within fifty years the old-time conditions—under which the tradesman owned his lot, his shop, his tools and the fruit of his labor, under which he found his own market and regulated supply to demand—have practically disappeared. Small proprietorships of peasant, mechanic, merchant have given way to huge agricultural, industrial and mercantile capitalizations. The process goes on with giant strides. To use the expression of Karl Marx, "one capitalist kills many." The collectivist, then, is waiting for large capitals to absorb the smaller. He will thus find created for him a few millionaires on the one hand and a race of wage-earners on the other. The essential preparatory work will be done for him (as he could not do it himself) by the trusts and monopolies, the inevitable outcome of competition. As the capitalists by absorption grow fewer, the workers must increase in numbers, and they must also increase in misery, since they can have nothing to say about production, market or price. This development must go on until the workers revolt by using the legal means of suffrage which has been put into their hands. But when they revolt, it will be as a united, organized, disciplined body, into which they shall have been formed by the very methods of the capitalist system, Then, as capitalists expropriated the many for the benefit of the few, the many will turn around and expropriate the few for the benefit of all. This is the prospective evolution.

The plan of allowing all industries first to reduce themselves to a few controlling centres of capital is comparatively slow of execution. But it is regarded by the collectivist thinker as a necessary preparation of the masses for the final step by which all the centres will be made one. Hence we do not find collectivism attacking centralization. This tolerance it extends even to the matter of huge armies, feeling that when the new era dawns there will be no danger of a military struggle, since the armies will be made up from the ranks of the workers. Therefore, the collectivist leader and thinker is not in a hurry. He knows that from private ownership of all the means of production according to the old competitive method, to common, public ownership of all the means of production, a single leap is an impossibility. He is satisfied with promoting the preparatory work which must necessarily be done, and which is actually being done for him by the monopolies, trusts, huge corporations. These centralizations are an object-lesson which accustoms minds to concede the feasibility of a still more centralized management. In the end, all that the collectivist will have to do will be to unite under one management the two, three or four great corporations of a given industry—steel, coal, oil, paper, sugar, tobacco—and then, at one stroke, by a combination of the industries, to eliminate the slavery condition of private capital and reap the fruit of common ownership.

The present phase of the movement, then, may be designated as one of party organization. The chief stimulus used to effect the organization, one that appeals best to individual sensibilities, is the picturing of the misery of labor. This misery is easily admitted to come precisely from the trust, and the trust is as easily proved to be the necessary consequence of private capital. In this is found a solution of what to many seems a contradiction: namely, on the one hand to expose and deplore the misery that comes from concentrated capital, and on the other hand, negatively to promote the very capitalism that intensifies the misery. But there is a double purpose in it all: first, to show the possibility of a still greater concentration; and secondly, by exhibiting the private monopoly as the necessary consequence of competition, to increase discontent and make the suffering people clamor for what is presented as the sole remedy—the placing of all wagework absolutely under common control. Hence, we see the collectivists refusing to endorse restrictive legislation against trusts, saying that this can only perpetuate the private competition which has been the root of all the misery; and that the only admissible legislation in the matter is that which makes for common ownership.

When we hear them using Proudhon's expression, "Property is robbery," we must be careful to understand that they do not charge the individual property holder of to-day with being a robber. They are attacking a system from which, they concede, the property holder has no escape, but under which the wage earner can never get the value of his work. Under the capitalist system into which competition must necessarily fall, the surplus value of a day's labor, the profit, which once went at least to the small competitor, is now added simply to the accumulations of capital, to minister to the luxury of the few and to strengthen the few in their power of determining the serfdom of the many. The individual capitalist is not blamed for this. He is not accused of personally robbing the wage earner of the surplus value of his work. He is recognized as being the fortunate one in what is called the "anarchy" of competition, an anarchy upheld by civil statute; and so long as he wishes to compete he must abstract as much as he can from the fruit of labor. It is the system, then, which has to be changed. The root has to be dug up. Competition must be eliminated and in its place there must be substituted, also by law, a collective ownership in which there will be no wage earners and no capitalists as persons adequately distinct. All must be producers for their own benefit in the benefit of all.

Once more, we must be on our guard against a prevalent vague notion that the main tenet of the actual socialism, collectivism, is the periodical dividing up and redistribution of all properties, so as to preserve equality of possessions amongst the citizens. Whatever may have been the meaning of some old forms of communism, the collectivism of to-day does not contemplate this at all. It aims simply at common ownership of all the means of production, to the end that each one may receive a wage, a compensation due to him for the labor which he has expended upon the common production.

Still further, we must know that the collectivist system does not propose to dispossess the capitalist brutally, whilst depriving him of the privilege of drawing an interest on his capital or his plant. It will, of course, prohibit all private industry for profit, and thus all instruments and machinery, as private capital, will become useless. But the collectivist proposes to make some compensation. Private producers will be privileged to transfer their plants to the collective state, and they will receive in return an annuity for a number of years, to be fixed according to the value of what they have transferred. This annuity will be in the form of labor certificates. With these certificates the common produce can be obtained and the common service can be utilized, so that the heretofore capitalist, and perhaps his descendants, may live in luxury for ten or twenty or forty years. But no one of them all may go into business; they may not produce; they may not make their capital grow. When the scrip shall have been used up the descendants shall have to go to work like the rest of the people.

We believe that the foregoing outline contains a very fair statement of the *fundamental tenet* of collectivism. We do not think that in the flood of socialistic journals and pamphlets there will be found a clearer or more comprehensive statement of the first principle of the party which bids for the politico-industrial management of civil society. We have dispensed with citations which, though they might lend an air of erudition, would add nothing to the conviction of a publicly recognized fact.

Now for a practical view of the operation of the fundamental principle let us suppose the collectivist state to be agreed upon, and an effort set on foot to put it into running order. There are three things which we may conceive to be necessary for the very existence and continuance of a civil community along those lines of material civilization with which no one would be willing to dispense. These three things are, briefly, freedom of individual demand, a more or less determinate unit measure of value for the purposes of exchange, and freedom of the individual to choose an occupation and to qualify for the same. No one accustomed to the present material civilization will be willing to change it for a new order of things, unless under that new order he shall be able to provide himself with what he needs, or thinks he needs, as easily as at present; unless he shall have some measure of value and medium of exchange no less convenient than the article which we now call money; and unless he shall have at least the same chance which he now has to select his occupation and to vary the same. In the present advanced stage of material civilization, these three things are necessary as stimulus or aid to the development of individual capacity. Now it has never been demonstrated that a state founded on the fundamental tenet of collectivism can supply these three needs of the individual in the modern civilization.

Take first the case of the supply for every individual demand. First and foremost before all things, what the new collectivist state will have to do will be to regulate supply according to demand. And if that state is to be a success, the supply must be regulated even better than it is to-day. We must understand at the outset that in the new state the entire production, the kind and amount produced and the distribution of all things, in all places, for all emergencies, will necessarily have to be managed by bureaus or committees. It is hardly possible for a human intellect to conceive the enormous governmental machinery which will be required for this one function of the new state. There is here implied not merely the regulation of the supply of coal oil, or shoes, or perfumery, or books, or millinery, or tobacco, or quinine, or coal, of ink, rouge, razors, ice cream, fans, chewing gum—but the supply of each of these and of all of these and of everything, absolutely, that is used and is called for, and of everything that *may* be called for. If that new state cannot and does not actually do this, then instead of being a liberation it will be an enslavement; instead of securing freedom it will open at once as the most galling despotism. In the system of free small competition I can always get what I want. The thing I desire may be useful or it may be useless; but for the moment I imagine that I need it, and so imagining, I can always get it. Under the small competitive system it requires very little demand to induce some one to undertake to supply the demand. I can always find a mechanic who will take my job and try to execute my idea. My idea may not be the most scientific. That matters very little to the mechanic; but it matters much to me, in my present mood, to have my idea carried out. This freedom of individual demand, taken in the aggregate, is a primary essential in the material benefits which man is to draw from civil society. I can always have my demand supplied when there is an individual, personal profit to be made by supplying the demand. But where governmental machinery will have to be moved in order to carrry out my odd idea—which to me is a very bright one—and where the committee can look for no special profit, but only for trouble, in deserting its routine, I cannot expect to get the service which I could easily get from the independent tradesman. Anything outside the established routine of production will then be obtainable only under the difficulties which now attend the passage of a law through a City Council.

It is necessary to keep this point in mind: that, in the new state. the total population must inevitably be at the mercy of a ruling committee and of a system of committees, and that it is only through the good will of the committee that an individual can have done for himself what he pleases and when he pleases. In the suppression of free demand, therefore, by the elimination of free production an insuperable obstacle is put to the development of individuality and to the practical. untrammeled exercise of that inventive spirit upon which the purely material progress of a community depends. The new system thus affects not merely the prospective progress, but also the actual contentment of the community; for there can be no contentment in a community when the individual is prevented from spending his earnings upon the things which he happens to fancy.

It is a patent fact that in the socialistic programmes this difficulty of supply to demand has never been satisfactorily or honestly discussed. There is abundant promise to the proletaire of magnificent festivals, excursions, pageants, concerts which every one will be obliged to take in the crowd. But no regard is shown for that domestic exclusiveness of entertainment and that quiet relaxation which as we all know form the true enjoyment of the better part of the community.

Under this new system, we have to recognize, there will be no usury, no private monopoly. There will be no tenancy or leases, no renting of houses, no real estate agents, no mortgages, no stocks or stock exchanges. There will be no display made by competitors in shop windows, no trading of any kind, no coinage of money, no silver question. Money means private capital that can be introduced into private enterprise for private gain. There could be no private enterprises. There would be only bureaus and committees to decide upon the production and transport of goods, according to the judgment which the committees would be pleased to pass on the needs of the people. If the wives of the bureaus decided that stuffed birds should not be worn on autumn hats, it is reasonable to suppose that there would be no stuffing of birds during the summer, or that there would be a lovely row in the homes of the bureaus. Salesmen and saleswomen would not care what you asked for in return for your certificate of a day's labor. They could have no interest in pleasing you. You would have no chance to toss up the goods on the counters two or three times a week. You would have to know precisely what you wanted when you wandered into the dull warehouse on a bright afternoon. The markets and shops of to-day are merely a consequence of competitive production. In the new state there would be no occasion for them. There would be no page advertisements of startling bargains in the Sunday newspapers. There could be no advertisements at all. There would be no bargains, for there would be no rival establishments. The newspaper would be no power in trade or politics. There would be no trade. Politics would be a thing of the past, just as rival show rooms and warehouses and those obsolete terms of wholesale and retail.

Where, then, would the interest of the individual be supposed to come in? In this simply, as we have stated, that every man would be supposed to obtain a wage that would be considered to represent the full value of his labor. And this leads to speak of what we placed as a second requisite in the modern civilized State, namely, some approximately fixed and determinable unit measure of value for the purposes of exchange.

In the new state there could be no real money, as we understand the term. With us real money is both measure of value and medium of exchange. In the new state the two functions of money would have to be distributed. They could not be combined in the same article or instrument. As each member of the community would be supposed to be remunerated according to his contribution in labor to the general store or service, labor itself, in some way or other, would necessarily have to be the measure of value. The medium of exchange, then, since the labor or the product could not be passed around, would needs have to be a certificate of labor contributed. This certificate could not be in the form of gold or silver or anything which might have its own value, as a commodity, over and above the labor represented. In the collective state, then, the measure of value would be the labor contributed; and the certificate of labor would be the medium for the purchase of the common produce and the utilization of the common service.

The *labor hour* as the standard measure of value is, indeed, the pivot of the whole collectivist scheme. But it is a pivot which will support nothing; and any scheme which attempts to turn upon it must go to pieces from a thousand and one disasters. Moreover, after going through the long and laborious and specious discussions of Marx and the other collectivist Solons, we discover that it is precisely this solitary, fundamental, essential basis and support of the whole super-structure that they have failed to determine, and that they do not dare to determine.

As a basis for the standard of value and for the medium of exchange there is nothing which I can conceive of as being less determinate or less determinable than the labor hour.

There are two ways only of counting the labor hour: by time employed and by value produced. Is all labor to be paid according to *time* given, with absolute equality? Or is the scrip certificate to have its purchasing power from a given *amount* which has been produced and which shall be regarded as the unit of value? If the labor hour is to be paid by mere time, then, when you are working amongst a hundred men, and you are working harder than the ninety-nine, they will be receiving the fruit of your labor and you will be receiving none of theirs. They will be reducing your wages and you will be raising theirs. This is against the fundamental tenet of collectivism, *i. e.*, that every man shall receive the full wage due to his labor. In a population of a million you will have to know that 999,999 are working as industriously for you as you are working for them. To be satisfied that the principle is in operation, you must know that you are not laboring to cover over other men's laziness and fraud of time. If you give to each labor hour of the industrious, of the lazy, of the skilled, of the ignorant, the same remuneration it will not take thirty days to banish from the community every indication of industry and skill. In sixty days the collective society will be bankrupt, because there will not be on hand the produce which the scrip calls for. If you get a dollar for your hour's work, no matter how much you do and no matter how you do it, it stands to reason that you shall not expend your energy and care to earn a dollar which you can get with equal certainty for the same slow, heedless hour which your neighbor devotes to the public service of production. It is simply incredible that intelligent collectivists of twenty years ago should not have seen the contradiction between the end intended, *i. e.*, the remuneration of labor to its full value, and the means proposed to accomplish the end, *i. e.*, the measuring of the value of all labor equally by pure duration. The system was certainly very simple. Its simplicity brought it adherents, especially among the indolent. The simple system helped to create the party, and we see it still practically set forth to-day in the unwise demands of some local labor organizations. Still, Marx and other leading collectivists of his day found themselves obliged to recede from too much insistence upon the time measure for the value of the labor hour.

If we take the thing in reason, and in its entirety—as we must always do when discussing a scheme—we have to see that scrip certificates for hours of labor cannot possibly have a purchasing power beyond amount and value produced. A labor hour can give purchasing power to a scrip only by reason of some definite amount produced in the hour of labor. If a thing has not been produced it cannot be purchased. Now, there are no two men whose hour of labor can be counted upon to give exactly the same results. Neither is the labor hour of the same person always uniformly productive. The value of the scrip to have any definite purchasing power must be measured by the minimum production. It stands to reason, then, that each one will produce his minimum, seeing that he can receive no more for the scrip that testifies to his labor. We cannot conceive of the long continuance of a state where every citizen is doing as little as he possibly can to the end that he may not be imposed upon by the idleness of all the other citizens.

The other way, as we have said, of making the hour of labor the measure of value is to take account of what is produced. This is, indeed, to eliminate pure time as a measure of value and to measure value by the need, desirability or mere demand (for demand may not be suppressed) of articles produced and services rendered. An estimate of value will have to be passed on everything that may be demanded. As a certificate scrip for production of one kind will have to be accepted in exchange for service and commodities of every kind, it will be necessary to establish a ratio of value between each resultant of labor and every other resultant of labor. Each resultant of labor through all the stages of production will have to have its schedule of fixed ratios with everything that can be produced and with every service that can be demanded; since the scrip representing it will have to be exchangeable for everything to be found in the community. Now, if as we are told, there is so much difficulty in maintaining a ratio between two metals as unvarying as gold and silver, the supply of which, as inert matter can, in a degree, be regulated, how shall we make up ratios for the labor hours of fifty million persons applying themselves in a million different industries to the production of things that are unequally necessary and of shifting desirability? If pure time measure for the value of the labor hour was marvelously simple, in this other only alternative of the collective state, the establishing of all the ratios, we have something that is no less marvelously complex.

The difficulty of the ratios will become manifest in a brief illustration. Let us take simply the *final* labor expended upon the finishing of a *few* articles that are now produced. Let us say, merely by way of example, that for this finishing labor A produces in an hour 30 pairs of suspenders; B produces 80 gallons of molasses; C, the milliner, produces 1 spring hat; D produces 9 kegs of nails; E produces 25 gross of wooden toothpicks; F produces 19 gross of hairpins, and G produces 1 violin. We are taking only a few articles, and we are considering only the last touches upon these articles. We are not considering the multifarious distinct kinds of productive labor hours that have previously been given. For this we should have to introduce the ploughing of fields, the planting of cotton and cane and flax, the mining, the smelting of copper and tin and iron, the felling of trees, the sawing of wood, the harvesting and gathering and carding and spinning and weaving, the manufacture of machinery, the transport, the storing, the dispensing for distribution of material, etc., etc. We leave all this out, though it would have to be introduced in the complete scheme even for these few articles as well as for a million more. Now, taking the labor of the finishing touches, where is the labor of the most value? Sit down for a year with your pencil and paper and work out the answer. Take your ten years or twenty. You cannot do it. Half the world believes that a working equivalent cannot be found between two pure metals, silver and gold. How shall it be found between a million, between fifty million articles produced, between all the various kinds of labor results contributing to their final production? What is the relative value of the labor hour employed in weeding a potato patch as compared with that devoted to sewing on glove buttons? How many dozen glove buttons will balance an acre of potatoes? If you are a collectivist and do not wish to commit yourself to paying for mere time, independently of what is done, you will be obliged to establish this little ratio, together with a million more. You will, besides, be obliged to reëstablish the ratios every day according to the fluctuating value put upon anything and everything by the changing tastes of the community.

But let us suppose that you have succeeded in laying down a few ratios between commodities or various kinds of public service, say, between street cleaning, making ice cream, playing the bass drum and pulling teeth. The ratios could not be established with anything like the exactness of the ratio that can be established between silver and gold. But let us suppose that you have succeeded in working out the six ratios, showing the value of each of these kinds of labor hour in terms of each of the others. How are you going to decide who is to have the privilege of applying himself to the most lucrative kind of labor? Who shall be obliged to take the labor that is less remunerated, even whilst he is willing and anxious and competent to do the better rewarded labor? In fairness there can be but one way to determine the individuals who are to have the preference: an examination test, established for every occupation and free to all comers. The whole land will be turned into a school of civil service contests. If you do not wish this endless examination, which will stop the wheels of business, you have but one alternative: you must allow the members of the committees to give the best places to their friends—and within sixty days you will have the community in a bloody revolution.

We dismiss altogether the question of hard labor, which has been utterly unproductive for the community, a question that must arise in regard to agricultural labor whenever there is a failure of the crops. Time measure here could be the only measure, and time measure, as we have seen, would mean the minimum of food.

In regard to this third point, namely, choice of occupation, let us take a single case in the higher professions. In the collective state, who will be the physicians? If there are to be physicians, they will, of course, have to be educated at the public expense. As the young men to be educated cannot be expected to have laid by any labor certificates to serve for their support during the time of their medical studies, it is clear that they will have to receive for their hours of study—say eight hours per diem—corresponding labor certificates as for so many hours spent in the public service. And, indeed, their services will have to be specially remunerated; for as they will be deprived of the active, open-air exercise which is the privilege of those who labor in the fields, they will require a more easily digested and hence a more costly nourishment. The daily bacon and cornbread which would be the delight of the herdsman and of the log-roller would bring chronic dyspepsia to the medical aspirant; and it is important, as a matter of grave moment in therapeutics, that the physicians who survive should not all be dyspeptic.

They will all have to be fittingly supported during their studies. This being fixed, there arises the problem of the selection of candidates. Let us suppose that one hundred physicians are considered to be sufficient for a given quadrangle of the collective state. How shall they be chosen? All the boys and girls of ten years of age will have a right to demand that they be educated for the medical profession. Here at the start there is an insuperable difficulty. But let us suppose that at length four thousand young men and women of the age of twenty years present themselves to begin the medical studies. Out of these it may be necessary to select three hundred, in order to make allowance for death and failure. The selection will have to be made by a committee. Will it select at random? That would not be justice to the community. Will it select its friends? That would not be the equality of distributive justice which is the professed aim of the collective state. Will it select according to previous examinations in schools of arts and letters? Knowledge of arts and letters is not a criterion of certain very important qualifications which should be looked for in those to whom the lives of the community are to be entrusted. There are certain moral and physical qualities which can exhibit themselves only in the course of practice, and which—any physician will attest it—go far to make up the necessary equipment of the medical practitioner who is to be of real value to the community. These things cannot be foreseen by any committee. Hence no committee can make a fit selection of subjects for education in medicine.

We shall, nevertheless, suppose that the committee does make a selection of the three hundred who are to pursue the medical studies. As we have said, these students will have to receive their salary or wages for study. What guarantee can we have that they will really fit themselves for the best public service? For, the practice of medicine will have to be a public service, since there can be no competition. No more can be done than to establish a minimum percentage which one must reach in order to be accepted as the public servant. And in the doing of this the entire medical profession is reduced to a minimum of excellence. For, nine-tenths of those who, under the system of private competition, would have labored for a maximum of excellence, will, under the new system, labor only for the minimum which is demanded for the earning of the daily wage in the public service—the only thing they can aspire to. In a word, the entire profession is degraded, and the entire community is put at the mercy of half-educated charlatans. Drugs, medicines, under the new system, will have to be as free as water. The members of the community, on labor hour certificates, cannot be expected to lay by enough to cover the expenses of a long illness. Everything for the infirm and the incapacitated will have to be done by public hospital service. But where nurses and doctors and all entrusted with the health of the citizens are qualified for their service by a minimum examination, we may well pity the community that is subjected to the collusion of such servants whose wages are independent of the efficiency of their service.

This is but one illustration which we have chosen to pursue out of a hundred thousand. The collectivists do not go into these details. They are careful to avoid such details. They keep on crying, "The fruit of labor for the workman and down with capital." They pose as reformers; but their reform when investigated is seen to consist simply in tearing down and not in building. In no one of their programmes have they presented a practical satisfactory detail upon any point of the new system which they offer to establish.

We may remark here that it is a necessary consequence of the collectivist scheme that every person who is at least *willing* to work must be entitled to the labor wage. Hence it must be a socially inevitable fact that at all times there shall be many who shall receive the labor wage whilst doing no work. For it is impossible that *all* persons in the same locality shall always be producing. Yet such persons are fully entitled to the labor wage, for the principle of equality demands that it be not arbitrarily given to one in preference to another. If, however, actual labor should be counted a necessary condition for the receipt of the wage, then those for whom there would be nothing to do in a locality would have to be transported at public expense to another locality where labor would be possible. Thus there would be an endless shifting of populations; there would be a continual breaking up of families—a vital blow given to one of the fundamentals of human liberty.

To return to the second of our questions, the new socialism has set itself the task of specifying what it means by the labor hour as the measure of value—whether that measure is to be the time of the labor or the utility, necessity, desirability of the result: the hour or the product. As we have seen, the product must necessarily enter into the standard. But, as we have also seen, this will give us a standard the most fickle, fluctuating and complex that could possibly be devised. For the purpose of avoiding a more bewildering complexity we have omitted to hint that even the use value of a product could be justly decided upon in no other way than by the voice of the whole community. If a few individuals want a certain article and this article has to be produced for them, the labor expended for their idea would be so much labor taken from the production of what is really desired and used by the whole community; and it is, therefore, by reason of the diminution of the supply, an increase in the price of the commodity that is demanded by all. Socialist leaders see their dilemma. Hence they are reticent or over-cautious in their expressions upon the use value of labor. They are apprehensive of the shoal of rocks upon which their phantom ship must go to pieces. For the most part, therefore, we find them still *specifying* by the *time* and *glossing over* the general *use value* of the labor in which the time is spent. But this mere time value, the equal wage for all time service, is the most galling civic tyranny that can be exercised upon the intelligence, industry and enterprise of a population.

Unfortunately, it is precisely this prospective despotism to be exercised over the attentive, the careful, the industrious and the conscientious that has contributed as much as anything else to swell the ranks of the new socialism as a political party. The lazy, the chronic grumblers, the dissatisfied, the improvident are swept into the political maelstrom by the momentum of their own inertia. The deeds of the socialists in Italy and Belgium during the past two years are evidence of the methods by which a dangerous class of men, under the name of a recognized political party, are ready to execute their programme the world over. Debarred from political recognition under their own name or tenets, we find promoting the socialistic demands that entire class which, with change of time or locality, has made up what has been known as nihilism, the internationale, the commune, the "reds"—the class that has wrought all the destructive revolutions from the days of the "Terror." There are certainly intelligent and able men at the head of the collectivist movement. But so were there intelligent and sincere men at the head when the reform of the last century began; but they were swept away by a turbulent sea. It is the time-standard for the value of labor which has, for the present, merged into the social collectivist party that entire class which wants a paternal state where there will be a wage for every hour; where a committee, representing the paternity of the state, will set the task, and where no one will have a chance to grow rich.

It is precisely the promotion of this socialistic time pay principle which has done most, primarily, to bring dishonor and discredit upon what ought to be, as five centuries ago it used to be, the most potent force to keep the social equilibrium. I mean the trades guild or labor union. The trade union has often enough alienated its friends and set itself in antagonism to those who would have been its best support, by insisting upon the time employed rather than upon the excellence of the work done as the measure of the labor wage. It would be interesting to learn how far the application of this socialistic principle, as the working basis of certain trades unions, has been responsible for some of the uncomfortable strikes by which communities have been afflicted. I have seen as many as seven hundred operatives walk out of one establishment because the manager refused to pay the wages of the skilled laborer to one man who was not skilled and who could not do the work that was called for. The union insisted upon his having the full wage simply because he was a member of the union. And because the manager would not sanction this socialistic tyranny the whole establishment went out upon a strike by order of the dictator.

We have said nothing of the attitude of the new socialism toward religion. Our purpose has been solely to consider the political possibility of the economic scheme as judged by its fundamental principle. The religious attitude of the polity would be matter for special consideration. This much, however, may be said, that the general literature of the movement, together with the character of a vast body of men from whom it is getting its support, leave no room to conjecture that it would or could be other than strictly materialistic, that is atheistic and purely irreligious.

Taking, then, the temporal view alone, we have to remember that there is no temporal advantage which can compensate a man for the loss of his individuality, his personal liberty, his native autonomy. In this view the development of individuality implies the right to earn and the right to learn. From what we have said it ought to be manifest that the collectivist paternalism stands in the way of individual development by practically forbidding the untrammeled exercise of the right to earn. But the scheme is equally obstructive of individual development in the other way, and as thus obstructive it is, perhaps, the more imminent danger to us at the present hour. There is a slavery not alone of the body, but also of the soul. Besides the slavery of matter there is a slavery of mind. There can be a slavery not only of muscular energy, but even of the energies of thought. And it is precisely in the intellectual sphere—even in the temporal order—that collectivism is to exercise its most disastrous effects upon the native liberties of the individuals of the collection. Under the system the individual cannot be privileged to get the education which he knows to be best, whether for himself or for his children. The entire management of the intellectual culture will necessarily be in the hands of the bureaus. If the bureaus decide that a certain book is not to be printed, it shall not be printed. It will be consigned to oblivion with its author. If the author does not choose to write so as to suit the ideas of the committee, he cannot get into print; for the entire plant will be at the dictate of the committee. The committee cannot print everything at everybody's request. It will have to make a selection; and it will select according to its prejudices.

The most terrible tyranny, then, of the collectivist state will be the tyranny over thought. It might be a surprise to many to hear it affirmed that where they would look last for the realization of the paternal despotism, namely, in the domain of truth and the realms of thought, right there has the collectivist principle found its most comprehensive application. Men who would repudiate scornfully the imputation of an alliance with the collective socialist movement are doing more than any other class to promote that movement and to prove its feasibility. It is in the advocacy of control of the thoughts of the young through committees and bureaus that the new socialism is striking its strongest blows, silently and with telling effect. If people are not now willing to be awakened to the truth of this they shall awake upon a day to find that their sons and daughters have been led into an intellectual captivity such as has not been since the beginning of the world.

William Poland, S. J.
St. Louis University.

MEGA SPELÆON, OR THE MONASTERY OF THE GREAT CAVE.

IN the early years of its existence monastic life was identical in the East and in the West. But this identity rapidly disappeared. For while the Western monk, more active and sympathetic than his Eastern prototype, could not hold himself aloof from the temporal and spiritual welfare of his fellow-Christians, the Eastern monk became more and more selfish, spent his religious solicitude in caring for no one's soul or body except his own; and while remaining a passionate defender of Eastern dogma, never was worried by the duty of laboring either with hand or with intellect for the amelioration of the moral condition of other men.

The Western monk interested himself in the daily life of the people and rivaled the lay-priest's care of souls. His superiority of learning and austerity of life rendered him more efficient than his secular confrère, and the result was that the lay-priest had to imitate him, and practically became a monk, in order not to lose his sway and influence. The Western lay-priest accordingly accepted the celibacy and office and secluded life of the monk, remaining different only by his not taking up his abode within the walls of a monastery. This influence, however, was mutual, and not all from one side, as is evident. Although each set of clergy, by a kind of natural fitness, devoted itself rather to one kind of work than to another, yet no kind was exclusive property. In reality, therefore, the religious of the West differs from the secular only in the very unimportant accidentals of dress and routine of life.

While, then, the priests of the West are practically all monks, and the monks of the West have nearly all become secular, this useful amalgamation has not taken place in the East. There the secular priest has accepted almost nothing from the regular; and the monk although in some countries, as in Russia, encroaching on the domain of the secular priest, has not assimilated himself unto him. This lack of assimilation is as natural in the East as it would have been strange in the West. For in the East the monk has really no qualities exclusively his that would add lustre to the life of other men; and the secular has no special virtues distinguishing him from any good member of his flock that the religious might be moved to emulate.

In Greece and Turkey monasticism has essentially remained what it was centuries ago; and in this connection it is not out of place to remember that what does not change and grow, if a thing of life, is probably in the stage of decline or decrepitude. Monasticism is not, however, on the same level in all parts of the East. In some countries, as in most of Russia, it is still in vigorous activity. In Greece, however, it has become a useless institution, and unless renewed by being thoroughly reformed, will soon lose what little influence it still possesses.

The following historical and descriptive sketch of one of the most noted monasteries of the East, and the most celebrated and popular one of the modern kingdom of Greece, will, at least indirectly, furnish some idea of what monasticism has been here what it is, and what the Greeks think of it. My judgments, if not formed on theirs, agree therewith. They properly respect the monasteries and monks not exclusively in proportion to their worth to-day, but also in relation to their historic past. My sketch will follow this idea, and will describe the monastery as it appeals to the Greek, and as it really is.

Mega Spelæon is not the only famous monastery of free Greece. For Hagia Lavra in Arkadia, the Meteora in Thessaly, the Taxiarchs near Ægion and others also have their peculiar historic reputation. But Mega Spelæon has been more closely connected with the varied life and fortunes of the people, and has partaken of their aspirations more than any of these others. It is also the largest in respect of the number of monks and the most noted in respect of wealth.

Mega Spelæon is located in the northern part of the Peloponnesos and in the province of ancient Arkadia, near to where the mountains of Arkadia join the neighboring ones of Achaia. It is situated high on the slope of a long cliff overlooking the rocky bed of the Erasinos river, which brings down into the Korinthian Gulf portion of the waters of the Aroanian and Erymanthian mountains. The monastery stands about one mile above the river, to the east.

Formerly Mega Spelæon was quite difficult of access. It could be reached only on foot or by pony, as no wagon road either in ancient or in modern times has been cut across these Arkadian cliffs. The nearest centres of civilization in the late middle ages, and up to the present time, were the village of Kerpine, where the French chieftains of Charpigny built one of their fortresses, and which is distant by a walk of two hours; the town of Kalabryta, distant to the south more than two hours; Korinth, sixteen hours away towards the rising sun, and Patræ, twelve hours towards the west. Now, however, a pilgrimage to Mega Spelæon involves no unpleasant journeying whatsoever. In 1895 a military railroad was built through the gorge of the Erasinos, and thus easy communication now exists between Northern Arkadia and the Korinthian Gulf. This railroad is of the toothed kind. The ascent is in some places dangerously steep, as can be judged from the fact that the station in Kalabryta, although distant only twenty-one chilometres from the station near the gulf, is two thousand one hundred and seventy-five feet higher. The ride up this incline is wonderful. The train, consisting of an engine and one open car, creeps up along its rocky path, over waterfalls, under tunnels, over high and short bridges, under cliffs so tall that one cannot see the top from the cars at times, with the Erasinos surging and boiling alongside. Just below the monastery is a small village with the strange name of Zachlorou, where the cars stop. Zachlorou is nineteen hundred and fifty feet high, although it is distant only eleven chilometres from the gulf. From Zachlorou to the monastery, which is about ten hundred and fifty feet above the station at an angle of about forty degrees, the ascent is made by donkey along a zig-zag path. About half an hour is required to make the ascent.

The history of the monastery has been written by one of the most noted of modern scholars in the Greek Church, Œkonomos ex Œkonomon. It was published in the year 1840, under the title of "Ktitorikon or Proskyneterion of Mega Spelæon," in Greek. But the early centuries of the history of the monastery are so enveloped in obscurity and pious story that they cannot be clearly examined. Its later history, however, and the part it took in the stirring events that occurred in Greece at the beginning of the present century are well known.

It seems probable that the original monastery was established on the exact site of the present one, that is, in the cave from which the institution takes its name. The custom of founding monasteries and churches in caves was a frequent one during the early and middle ages of Christianity. It came in part from the habit which the anchorites cultivated of not surrounding themselves with anything that resembled artificial luxury. To such men these caves afforded a natural, easy and sufficient shelter. All throughout the East may be found monasteries that originated from a cave and a cave-dwelling anchorite.

It is this spacious grotto, then, that furnished to the monastery its name of Mega Spelæon, or the Great Cave. Ecclesiastically it should rather be called "the monastery of the Assumption," since it is established in honor of the Blessed Virgin, and celebrates with special pomp the feast of the 15th of August in her honor. But the other name is the only one in official as well as in popular use. And a precious image of the Blessed Virgin, which is kept here, is known everywhere throughout Greece, in its copies, as the "Panagia Megaspelæotissa," or the Madonna of the Great Cave.

The cave itself is about ninety feet high and one hundred and eighty feet long. It is on the mountain side, at the foot of a towering and perpendicular face of solid rock that rises about five hundred feet straight in the air above it. It is quite deep, so that the principal building of the monastery is entirely within it and beneath its roof. And a stone rolled from the summit of the cliff above will fall clear of this cavity and the monastery.

From a distance the monastery can be seen only from the mountain heights west of the longitude of the cave. Mysteriously picturesque does it appear from the top of the ruined citadel of the Frankish knights of La Tremoille near Kalabryta, and from a few points along the banks of the Erasinos, especially from a place called "the Maiden's fount," and from the higher parts of the opposite village of Zachlorou. But from a distance it is very difficult to find a point from which all the buildings are visible, because from most of the neighboring lookouts a portion of the group of curious buildings, and oftenest the principal one, is hidden behind some mountain projection. Most often only the old tower on the edge of the cliff above the monastery can be seen, the tower built as a defense against the Egyptian army of Ibraim Pasha in 1827.

The principal building is mostly seven stories high. The lower portion is built of stone and the upper stories of wood. Most of this stone portion is about four stories high; but since its various sections do not all begin from the same ground level it does not all rise to the same horizontal line at the top. Indeed one could easily think that irregularity in lines and lack of symmetry were intentionally provided for by the successive architects of the buildings. The façade of this central building forms not a straight line, but an irregular segment of a circle, following the contour of the cave. It is the custom here in Greece to cover the roofs of houses with brick tiles. This, however, cannot be done at Mega Spelæon, because in winter gigantic icicles form on the rocky side of the cliffs above and fall with tremendous force upon the monastery. These roofs have therefore to be made of thick planks, capable of resisting the violence of the falling ice.

A characteristic of the Greek is that he never makes repairs. This truth is well illustrated here at the monastery. Nothing after being once constructed is ever restored, and injured parts are never renewed if possible until progressing decay necessitates complete demolishment and reconstruction. Accordingly, the various buildings with their crooked lines and unsymmetrical shapes are made even more picturesque by their rickety and dilapidated appearance.

In front of the monastery, towards the Erasinos, the higher slopes of the mountain side are all carefully terraced and cultivated. Various kinds of vegetables and fruits are raised here by the monks, each one of whom, assisted by his famulus, tills a small patch, from which he supplies his table. These terraces and hanging gardens are separated off from each other by supporting walls of stone and by irregular rows of trees and flowering shrubbery. The walls are covered with masses of ivy and wild vines in most luxuriant profusion. A number of these enchanting gardens can be seen from the windows of the monastery. Nightingales and other sweet-voiced birds fill the air with music morning and evening. The monks have the good quality of being lovers of nature. And the slovenliest of them will cultivate a few flowers in his garden, and perhaps have a song bird in his cell. Having once climbed to the top of the cliffs that overhang the monastery to the tower where Ibraim's Egyptians were repulsed, I came suddenly upon a priest robed in cassock and kalimavki standing statue quiet in among the bushes, and on inquiry learned from him that his lonely posing was due to his watching some young bullfinches which had just left their nest. He had already caught one and had it imprisoned, chirping and fluttering, in the pocket of his cassock. He said that he wanted them for his cell, as the bullfinch is an excellent songster. But when I met him again, a few days later, he hastened to tell me with sorrow that his prisoners of melodious hopes had died.

The story which the monks narrate as to why the site was selected is that within the cave an image of the Madonna was discovered by a native shepherdess of Zachlorou, a pious girl named Evphrosyne, and that in consequence of this discovery two monks from Thessalonika, Saints Symeon and Theodoros, built a church and cells in the cave, and took up their abode in it. That the monastery is extremely ancient is beyond all doubt. And the tradition which asserts that it was founded by these two saints in the fourth century is perhaps not widely incorrect. The tradition is confirmed by the office which the monks sing in memory of its reputed founders, Symeon and Theodoros, who along with Evphrosyne are commemorated as local saints on the 18th of October. Archæological methods of reasoning bring the researcher back towards that period. And since the fourth century saw monasteries founded in many other parts of the Christian world, we do not yield much to tradition by not positively rejecting for the origin of Mega Spelæon a date so early.

In the year 1641 a terrible conflagration visited the monastery and consumed everything—the buildings, the church, the library and the archives. Nothing of importance within the buildings escaped the flames except the image of the Madonna, which the monks carried off to a place of safety. This annihilation of all older monuments and destruction of the records is what renders the early history of the monastery so obscure. Fortunately a few important documents were saved because they happened to be kept at that time not in the monastery, but in one of its various "metochia" or succursals. Among these were three golden imperial bulls from Constantinopol.

Documents have been preserved which show that the church which was reduced to ashes by the conflagration of 1641 had been rebuilt or renewed from still older foundations in the year 1285 with money sent from Constantinopol by the Emperor Andronikos II. One might suppose that since the Peloponnesos was at that time under the rule of the Franks, it was strange for an Emperor of Constantinopol to become the benefactor of a monastery within their dominions. But there could not have been much difficulty in doing so, for Villeharduin and his successors, who since the Fourth Crusade in 1204 held most of the Peloponnesos, never cut the church of their Greek subjects loose from Byzantine influence. Besides, the gift of Andronikos need indicate no imperial sway over the country. And moreover at that time the Emperor could hope for the return of the Peloponnesos to his dominions, for it was just then very carelessly governed from the West. It had lately been added to the possessions of Charles of Anjou, King of Naples. The King of Naples died in this year, and his successor, Charles II., was a prisoner in the hands of the King of Arragon. And his Viceroy, Robert, provided temporarily for the Peloponnesos by placing it under the care of the Duke of Athens, Guillaume de la Roche. But Guillaume had nearer and more vital interests in his own dukedom, and the Frankish possessions of the Peloponnesos were open to continual attacks from the garrisons of the Byzantine forts of Monembasia and Lakedæmon. It is also well known that Andronikos was a religious man. He followed the views of those that had opposed the ikonoklasts, being in favor of the images, and therefore was naturally well disposed towards a monastery where was venerated a picture of the Madonna reputed to be from the hand of the Apostle St. Luke. He also sent to the monastery one of the three golden bulls mentioned above.

The Megaspelæotes, after this fire of 1641, immediately set about rebuilding the church and monastery. Within the following year a good portion of the work was completed. And in the year 1653 the church, which had already been entirely rebuilt, was frescoed, as is testified to by an inscription over the great door of the narthex.

This new church, which dates from 1641, is probably, like the one that had been destroyed by the fire, a good specimen of the Byzantine style of ecclesiastical architecture. The church is not visible from without, as it is on the third floor of the principal building, and has no separate façade of its own. The main part of the church is in the form of a square, in the middle of which four pillars support a beautiful dome. As is usual in the East, the sanctuary is separated from the body of the church by a wall called the Eikonostasion. Three doorways lead through the Eikonostasion from the body of the church into the sanctuary. This eikonostasion is extremely rich, being of wood intricately carved and covered with gold. When looking at it one cannot fail to recall the luxurious Rococo ornamentations so much favored by the Jesuits in Italy and other parts of Europe. The eikonostasion receives its name from the fact that it is decorated with the eikons or images of Christ as King of Kings, the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, St. John the Baptist and the patron saints of the church.

To the right of the worshipers, in this eikonostasion, is the great treasure of the monastery, the image already mentioned, the Madonna which was saved from the fire of 1641, and which the tradition of the monks attributes to the hand of St. Luke. It is not a painting on canvas or on a flat surface, but is a carved image in high relief, made of wood and representing the Virgin holding the Child in her lap. It is probably a very old work. That it was, however, made by the Apostle seems to be merely a bit of pious credulity which adds to the incomes as well as to the fame of the monastery. The image is covered with a kind of wax, which the monks profess to know to be mastic. It has become very black with age and with the smoke of incense. The image may possibly be technically classed with those called "kerochyt," and finished by a process called "kerographia."

The decorations of the church of Mega Spelæon are rich and heavy. The effect is added to by the fact that the overhanging cave shuts out almost all the light of day from the little windows in the dome, allowing the church to be illuminated only by the softened light which streams in from the narthex through the open doorway, and by the candles and olive oil lamps that burn in front of the eikons. The walls are one solid mass of frescoes in heavy colors. These frescoes represent prophets and apostles and martyrs and saints and holy persons thousands in number, who seem in the dimness to be standing behind the stalls of the monks and listening with mysterious attention to the chants of the Holy Office. In the middle of the floor beneath the dome is carved in marble the two-headed eagle of the Emperors of Byzantion, which the Tsars of Russia have appropriated. It may be seen in all Greek temples of importance that were built while the Greek Church here was subject to Constantinopol. The entrance into the main portion of the church from the outside narthex is through a doorway which is closed by two massive doors of brass, made in Lebadeia in 1805. They are covered with figures and groups of figures in low relief, not of good but of pleasing art. Outside of these gates is the outer narthex, or vestibule, where those who come to visit the church may sit till the doors be opened.

Besides this church there are several small chapels. The church is called "katholikon," or "katholikos naos," because into it gather the "entire" community for such services as are intended for "all." The smaller chapels are five in number, one of them being sacred to St. Luke, as the painter of the miraculous image, and another to St. Evphrosyne, to whom the place of the hidden image was revealed. Sick persons who are often brought to the monastery to be relieved of their sufferings are placed in the chapel of St. Evphrosyne. It is so small that no more than three or four persons can enter it at once. As a rule these chapels are used only when more than one Mass is to be said; for, according to the canons of the Eastern Church, not more than one Mass may be celebrated at the same altar on the same day. Such a coincidence, however, is not so very frequent. For the priests usually celebrate Mass only when they have "intentions."

This monastery of Mega Spelæon belongs to the class called "stavropegiac." Stavropegiac churches and monasteries are entirely independent of the authority of the bishop and other local ecclesiastical authority in the diocese where they are established. They depend directly on the Patriarch of Constantinopol. The local bishop cannot interfere in the appointment of the abbot, in the admission of novices, or in the administration of the property of the monastery. Nor is he specially commemorated in the office and Mass. But these privileges are here in Greece now merely an empty historic title, for shortly after the establishment of the kingdom of Greece the Church was declared to be independent of the Patriarch, and Constantinopol now has no authority whatsoever over this and other such monasteries, the head of the Church in Greece being the Metropolitan Archbishop of Athens. At present the Mega Spelæon is supposed to be subject to the bishop of the diocese of Kalabryta and Ægialeia. But the see of this diocese has been vacant for years, and probably will long remain so. The vicars, who reside in Kalabryta and administer the affairs of the "widowed" diocese, as they call it, bother themselves very little about Mega Spelæon.

In consequence of its fame and high protection, Mega Spelæon became very wealthy. By legacies and other gifts it came into possession of property in every part of the Hellenic world, in European Turkey, in Asia Minor and in North Greece, besides its numerous possessions in the Peloponnesos. This wealth and property were secured to it repeatedly by imperial and patriarchal bulls. A number of the later patriarchal bulls referring to the monastery and its property are still in existence and are kept in the library. Of the imperial bulls only one is still in the possession of the monastery, that of John Kantakouzen, written in 6856 anno Mundi, that is 1358 A. D. Possibly Kantakouzen's bull was occasioned by the events of 1320. In that year the country round about Mega Spelæon passed again under the control of the Emperors, owing to the victories of the Byzantine general, Andronikos Asan. This change of rulers probably brought with it disputes as to the legality of the titles which the monastery held to some of its lands. And the object of the bull was to prevent greedy laymen from appropriating to themselves fields and forests belonging to the monastery. The bull may have been obtained through influence with the son of Kantakouzen, Manouel, who in this year was appointed Byzantine general in the Peloponnesos and established the seat of government in the Lakonian town of Misthra.

Similar circumstances later occasioned the loss of two of these imperial bulls. In 1684 the Republic of Venice declared war anew against the Sultan, and her armies, under the leadership of Morosini, succeeded in liberating the entire Peloponnesos from his yoke. By the treaty of Carlovich in 1699 the Peloponnesos was accordingly declared to be a Venetian possession. This new change of masters again occasioned disputes as to the legal ownership of certain lands which the monastery claimed. And to vindicate their rights the monks in the year 1715 sent to the government of the doges the three bulls in question, in order that the Republic might renew the privileges therein granted. Venice, however, did not pay much attention to the affair, probably foreseeing that her hold on the Peloponnesos was but temporary, and that it would not seriously benefit either monastery or Venice to restudy the questions at issue, as the possessions in dispute were liable at any time to again fall under Turkish rule. And in fact in 1713 war broke out afresh. Then Zacchæos, the monk who had brought the bulls to Venice, returned to his monastery so as to be with it in the dangers of war. In his hurry to depart from Venice he deposited the bulls with one of the secretaries of the government. The result of this war was that in 1715 the Grand Vizier Ali Koumourtzi had easily reconquered all of the Peloponnesos. After peace was restored the monks, being no longer subjects of Venice, asked for the return of their valuable parchments. The request was not readily complied with. And after much delay they were glad to recover the latest of the three, that of Kantakouzen; but even from this one the golden medallion or seal had been removed. Where this medallion now is, as well as the fate of the other two bulls, is not known. But they are probably in some historical collection somewhere.

The wealth of the monastery was so great that not many years ago the income annually was more than four hundred thousand dollars ($400,000). This made a yearly allowance for each monk of about fourteen hundred dollars. In those days the number of monks approached to three hundred. Now they are not more than one hundred and fifty. Of late years the income is not greater than perhaps twenty thousand dollars. There is no way of discovering the exact sum, although the abbot and counselors are supposed to render to the government a detailed account every year. There has, however, undoubtedly been a great decrease in the revenues of the monastery, both because it has gradually lost much of the property that it possessed outside of the Peloponnesos, and also because of the increasing laziness of the monks. The government of Greece, which is always hard pressed for funds, taxes this and all other monasteries quite severely, making it necessary for the monks either to become industrious or else to suffer somewhat by privation. Most of the monks prefer the second of the two evils.

A great portion of monastic property has been confiscated. Indeed it is quite probable that the government would mercilessly confiscate all valuable monastic property, were it not that by doing so it would commit the diplomatic blunder of giving the example to the Sultan. In Turkey there is a great deal of property in the possession of Greek monasteries. And these monasteries in Turkey have not lost their usefulness to Greece and the Hellenic cause. Accordingly it is to the interest of Greece to be solicitous that the monasteries within Turkish territory be not interfered with by the government of the Sultan. And therefore it cannot give the example of high-handed confiscation of similar property at home. Still confiscation quietly does go on. The ground on which the American School of Classical Studies in Athens stands once belonged to the monastery of the Angels. And there have not been wanting among the members of the Congress slavish men who have been looking about through monastic property to find a suitable tract to confiscate and donate to the third son of the King, since his older brothers have already been provided for. Mega Spelæon, however, will not be confiscated, for the entire nation would resist such an act.

The life of the anchorite has always had a great fascination for the Christian Greek. And monasteries have always been numerous in Greek lands. In Turkish times they were in many respects useful. The monasteries then were places where more or less of Greek and Christian learning was diffused and where Christians could occasionally assemble and feel that they were not under the eye of spies. The monks continued to care for the treasures of literary antiquity, or at least to sell them to Europeans, thus preventing their complete loss. Many became monks because few other professions then brought any kind of personal security together with a little honor. The Turk nearly always respected the monk.

The Greek Church has almost ceased to be a teacher. She no longer can be regarded as laboring intelligently in directing or forming the morals of the people. She presents herself to the Greek as a serious and energetic authority in no other domain than that of religion and religious rites. Every historian knows that at times there exists a divorce between morals and religion, and that people become careless or unaware of the connection between the two. This is unfortunately now approaching to be a fact in Greece. The Greek is not a bad man by any means, but it is not evident that he owes his virtue to his Church. In accordance with this view of religion the Greek who becomes a novice in a monastery is attracted not so much by the morality of monastic life as by its religiousness. And he and his friends think himself benefited by his becoming a monk, although he brings with him only the most ordinary virtues, and all of these he is by no means sure either of cultivating or of increasing.

At Mega Spelæon each monk may, if he chooses, keep under his direction one or more young boys, who after reaching the age of twenty-five years and spending three years in their patron's service as novices, may receive tonsure and become monks. The monastery as such rarely accepts novices. But the individual monks, as individuals, according to their own absolutely free choice, take these boys, who, known as "hypotaktikoi," that is "famuli," act as servants to their patron, and at the same time learn how to live a monastic life. They also often become the inheritors of his personal property. A not entirely unfounded opinion prevails that sometimes these famuli have reasons by paternity as well as by this spiritual adoption to be regarded as the proper heirs of their patrons.

The monks of Mega Spelæon belong to the class called "idorrythmic." As such they are to be distinguished from those others of the "cenobiac" type. Cenobiac monks live a life in common. All are under the direction of the abbot and the council, and must labor for the common good of the monastery, according to the will of their superiors. All eat at the same table. Food as well as clothing and other necessities are supplied from the common funds of the monastery. The idiorrythmic life, however, is very different. Each member of the community is to a great degree independent. He is indeed subject to certain general regulations, but can direct and employ most of his life as he wishes. At Mega Spelæon each monk receives from the common income and property of the monastery an amount of bread and wine and cheese sufficient for his support and that of his famulus. A small garden is also allotted to him in which he raises fruits and vegetables and salads for his table. He eats in his own cell, attended by his famulus, who prepares his food. There is no common table whatsoever.

Since wine and bread are common property, each monk is obliged to be ready to assist, either he or his famulus, in the cultivating of the fields that produce the wheat, in the irrigating of these fields and the vineyards, in the harvesting of the wheat and the gathering and pressing of the grapes. But as most of the lands are tilled by hired men or are pacted out to farmers, these labors occupy but a small fraction of his time. If he holds any office in the monastery or performs any duties other than those mentioned he receives a proportionate salary. The religious exercises in the church go on regularly, but he may attend or not almost as he pleases. And surely except on Sundays and feast days he is absent much more frequently than he is present.

The bread and wine and cheese, which is doled out free to all, is produced from the farms and vineyards and pasture lands of the monastery. In the wine cellar there are two famous old wine casks called "Stamates" and "Evangelios." Stamates holds twelve thousand okes, or nearly four thousand gallons. Evangelios formerly was much larger than Stamates, but one end of the cask decayed and had to be sawed off, so that Evangelios now contains only nine thousand okes, or somewhat less than three thousand gallons.

Monastic life in the East, as in the West, has been carefully legislated for in detail by the canons of various general and local councils, and these canons have been explained and amplified by the regulations of the greater and model monasteries, especially those on Mount Athos. The rules of these model monasteries are known in the East as the canons of St. Basil, and all monks in Greek countries are regarded as being "Basilian." But these careful rules now exist for the Megaspelæote, as for other Greek monastic communities, rather in theory than in daily application. Perhaps the only regulations which they never violate are those concerning fasting. And this is to us the more remarkable, as the fasts in the Greek Church are exceedingly severe. The monks, like a good portion of other Greek Christians, observe four separate lents every year, namely, the regular quadrigesima which they keep in common with the Catholics, a lent of two weeks before the feast of the Twelve Apostles, June 30, another of two weeks before the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin in August, and one of four weeks during the Advent of Christmas. These are all lents of severe abstinence rather than of fast. Besides the monks never fail to abstain similarly on all the remaining Wednesdays and Fridays of the year, avoiding all use of meat, fish, eggs, butter, cheese and oil.

The management of the community has at its head the Hegoumenos, or Abbot. Among all the abbots of the monasteries of Greece he of Mega Spelæon ranks first. He is a mitred abbot and has the privilege of carrying a crosier and of wearing robes similar to those of a bishop. He is elected for a period of five years, the monks of the monastery being the electors. Their choice, however, must be confirmed by the Holy Synod at Athens. Only such monks as have lived for six years in the monastery can have a vote in this election. The privilege of electing the abbot is conceded not only to Mega Spelæon, but to all monasteries where the number of monks is more than six. Where there are not six monks the abbot is appointed directly by the Synod at Athens.

In the management of affairs the abbot is assisted by two counsellors, who with the abbot constitute a body called the "hegoumenosymboulion." In case this body fail to arrive at a decision in regard to important matters, they call to their assistance such of the monks as have been previously abbots, and others who belong to the category of "gerontoteroi." The ex-abbots are usually two or three in number, and are known as "prohegoumenoi." The gerontoteroi are the aged monks that have spent a long and edifying life in the monastery. And if this larger body cannot settle the difficulties, then another class of monks called the "Senators" is summoned to take part in the deliberations. The Senators are monks of good standing who have arrived at the age of forty-five. Whatever be the decision of this congress consisting of abbot, counsellors, ex-abbots, gerontoteroi and senators, it is final. There is no higher authority in the monastery.

The monastery possesses quite a valuable library. It contains about twenty manuscripts of the Gospels. Of these the oldest one is written on parchment and dates from the eleventh century. The others are not so old. There are also specimens of rare editions of the classics and old editions of the fathers. These books and manuscripts are chiefly gifts. How interesting so ever they be to the bibliophile or to the palæographist or antiquarian, they have but little value, comparatively, as books for an ordinary library and for daily use. This fact is immediately evident to any one who visits the library, in spite of the repeated assertion of the librarian that the monks are very fond of reading. The monastery buys no new books as a rule. Individual monks may in this matter, as in others, follow their own inclination. The printed books in the library are mostly ecclesiastical and theological. Besides serving as a library, this room is a general cabinet of historical relics and curiosities. There are mitres of mediæval bishops, crosiers, jeweled crosses, relics of saints, rich old vestments, vellum manuscripts, patriarchal bulls, in profusion and confusion.

In general it may be said that just as real holiness is not much in vogue amongst the monks, so also is deep learning a lost art. A number of novices from Mega Spelæon have been sent to the higher schools to study; and at present there may be counted at least a score of Megaspelæotes who have taken a course in theology or philology. Nearly all of these have studied in the University of Athens, a few of them in Germany. But after completing their studies, if they receive no appointment calling them to labor as priests in some foreign mission, or as teachers or professors in some schools, they quickly forget their scientific habits and lose their inclination to study. Mega Spelæon, however, has good men engaged in professional duties outside of the monastery. There are in the United States two Megaspelæote priests laboring among the Greek emigrants. Several of the bishops of Greece are from Mega Spelæon, including the Metropolitan of Athens, the head of the Hellenic Church.

The monastery has always been a popular shrine for pilgrims. They come so frequently and regularly that the monastery provides a special "xenon" or hotel for them. No visitor is excluded from the hospitality of the monastery. These pilgrims go there to light a candle before the image of the Madonna, or to perform some other religious act, or have a Mass said, or make a confession and receive Holy Communion. Many come in consequence of a vow, having promised that if certain hopes of theirs be fulfilled, they would make a pilgrimage to the monastery. One can often see such people, especially peasants and women, performing these pilgrimages barefooted, through a desire to do penance.

But also a number of persons go to Mega Spelæon simply to enjoy a pleasant outing. There are two "xenons," one for the poorer and the other for the richer visitors. Those that have relations or friends among the monks, especially if they be friends of the abbot, are taken to private rooms and entertained elaborately. All visitors must arrive before sunset, as at that time the outer gates are barred, and it would be difficult to get near enough to persuade the man in authority to open them. Likewise all weapons must be left with the watchman at the entrance gate. This is a relic of the days of Turkish sway.

In Turkish times the monastery, on account of the protection which its sacredness afforded to the "rajahs," was regarded as a proper place for the Christians to meet once every year and hold a kind of fair, each visitor bringing whatever he had to sell and purchasing such objects as he had need of. Little merchants from afar came and exposed their wares and trinkets. But after the wars of liberation were over this practice was discontinued and the fair was transferred to the neighboring town of Kalabryta, where it is still held annually, at the same time of the year, the week preceding the feast of the Assumption, in August. At Mega Spelæon, however, the name still remains attached to a hill in front of the monastery, called "the hill of the fair;" and on its top is a chapel called the "Madonna of the fair" or the "Panegyristria."

The monks of Mega Spelæon on account of the manner in which they are recruited are from amongst the people of the neighboring provinces of Achaia, Arkadia and Korinthia. Being children of the people, they have always sympathized with the struggles of the people, and this at times when it was a sacrifice to do so. When in the year 1819 the Philike Hetæria, which had been organized in Odessa in 1814, and whose object was the liberation of the Christians of the East from Moslem rule, began to be more freely propagated in the Peloponnesos, Hierotheos, the abbot of Mega Spelæon, together with three other monks, were among the noted Peloponnesians that joined the society. And after the patriotic convention of the leading Christians at Ægion, five hours distant from the monastery, this Philotheos, being regarded as one of the most reliable and patriotic priests of the Greeks, was commissioned to travel through the Peloponnesos and communicate with the other rajahs and prepare them for the approaching strife by giving advice and collecting funds.

On account of its impregnable position the monastery was a frequent place of refuge for many during the awful wars of annihilation from 1821 to 1828. In 1821, at the outbreak of the struggle, when the Christians massacred the unfortunate Turks of Langadia, Kanellos Delegiannes, one of the most prominent Christians of that town, hurried his wife and children off to Mega Spelæon, in order that he might feel more at ease in fighting for his country. Likewise the family of the old hero Zaimes took refuge here more than once.

In spite of the benefits conferred on the cause of the Christians by the monastery and monks, it escaped all serious damage from the Turks. Only in the last year of the war, in 1827, was it threatened with impending destruction; but the danger was averted. The Sultan of Turkey failing of being able either to suppress or annihilate the Christians, after six years of fire and sword and assassination, called to his aid the bloody Ibraim Pasha of Egypt, offering him the country in fief if he could subdue it. Ibraim came with an army of Arabs and destroyed every thing in his way. In July of 1827 he came to Kalabryta, three hours away from the monastery. He was full of triumph, for he had captured and destroyed the immortal town of Mesolonghi, had ravaged and burned most of the Peloponnesos and had made many of the rajahs kiss his hand in submission. He brought an army of fifteen thousand men against the monastery. But Kolokotrones had by his wonderful skill succeeded in sending a band of his palikars there, who, uniting their strength to that of the monks, formed a defending body of about six hundred men. They dragged two or three old cannon to the top of the rock above the monastery, located them in the fort there and prepared to resist.

Ibraim to save himself the trip to the monastery sent three successive letters calling their attention to his proximity, to his large army and his artillery, and advising them to surrender and acknowledge his authority. According to a copy preserved in the monastery, the answer of the monks was as follows:

"Most high ruler of the army of the Othmans, hail. We have received your note, and we are aware of what you mention. We know that you are as near as the fields of Kalabryta, and that you have all the means of war. But for us to submit to you cannot be done, because we are under oath by our Faith either to get free or to die in war; and according to our belief it is not right to break our holy oath to our Country. We advise you to go and fight somewhere else. Because if you come here and conquer us the misfortune will not be very great, as you will merely rout some priests. But if you get licked, as we surely expect with the help of God, because we have a good position, it will be a shame to you, and then the Greeks will take heart and will hunt you down from all sides. This is our advice; you look to your interests like a knowing man. We have a letter from the Boulé and from General Kolokotrones that he will under all circumstances send us palikars and food, and we will soon all be free men or will die true to our holy oath of Country.

"Damaskenos the abbot, and the priests and monks with me. June 21, 1827."

Kolokotrones' aid-de-camp Chrysanthopoulos commanded the monks and pilakars that defended the monastery. For two days did Ibraim rage against it with infantry and artillery and cavalry. But he had to withdraw, concluding that the monastery was impregnable by its position and its defenders. He went back to Arkadia to continue his devastations elsewhere. Two months later his ships were sunk in the harbor of Navarino by the united fleets of Europe, and the Greeks were free.

Otho loved the monks of Mega Spelæon. Twelve of them did he especially honor, and with his own hand pinned the medals for bravery on their breasts. The room is still shown at Mega Spelæon where he slept. And the monks still love to tell of how he hugged some of the old heroes that had fought in the war of liberation; for many of the older monks still remember the great-hearted Catholic King, Otho the Bavarian.

DANIEL QUINN.

Kalabryta, Greece.

THE RISE AND FALL OF EVOLUTION BY MEANS OF NATURAL SELECTION.

IN this year of grace 1900 there has come from the press of D. Appleton & Co. the second volume of the "Revised and Enlarged Edition" of "The Principles of Biology," by Mr. Herbert Spencer. The first volume of this edition was published in 1898, and both together may be regarded as the last word, or, at least, the latest on the subject of evolution. They have the advantage, too, of coming from the highest living authority on the subject. Professor Haeckel is, indeed, still with us. His theory of evolution, too, like that of Mr. Spencer, did not confine the famous hypothesis to merely biological phenomena, but extended it to the inorganic world as well. As Professor Haeckel's enthusiasm, however, could never be made amenable to reason, and as his sanguine temperament too often led him to mistake imagination for reason and fiction for fact, his authority on the new doctrine never carried as much weight as that of Mr. Spencer. It is true that neither Professor Haeckel nor Mr. Spencer has contributed as much to the spread of the new doctrine as did the late Charles Darwin and Professor Huxley, but both Charles Darwin and Professor Huxley have already passed away, and many things have come to light even in the brief space since their exit. Mr. Spencer's volumes are the outcome of the newer light, the fuller experience, the more sober second thought, and while he still clings to a theory of evolution in some form or other, he deals some deadly blows against the Darwinian hypothesis from which it is impossible for it to recover. Unconsciously, too, and even somewhat naïvely he lays bare the weakness of evolution in any form yet advocated.

Mr. Spencer's confessions of the failure of evolution in the very form of which he himself was at one time so ardent an advocate naturally calls to mind the famous conflict, so called, of science and religion in this particular field. The last half century has been lighted up with the weird and lurid glare of the strange doctrine. The men of science, as they loftily styled themselves, strove to superinduce a reign of terror in the religious world under cover of the new theory. The overwhelming destruction of revealed religion was, we were told, inevitable. The Church was patiently awaiting her impending doom. Onlookers held their breath as they gazed on the swelling portents. Mediators and reconcilers were busy proffering their kind offices of intervention. Even the late Professor Mivart once threw himself into the breach to effect a reconciliation. But the case seemed hopeless. Religion was doomed—

and doomed not so much on account of its own inherent weakness as because of the irresistible strength of the opposing science. And now that the closing year of the century has come, it is somewhat amusing to find that once more it is not religion but science that confesses its weakness. In the light of Mr. Spencer's recent volumes it is interesting to review the history of the late movement of the doctrine of evolution.

The history of speculative science for the last half century has been, as we have said, one of noisy and aggressive boasting. Not content within its own sphere it invaded the provinces of religion. The strong were surprised; the timid were alarmed; the weaklings were in terror. Even in some who should be pillars of strength a visible slackening of courage might be noticed. Fresh crops of reconcilers sprang up from time to time, with the laudable aim of effecting a compromise that might be honorable to religion. The fathers of the Church were ransacked. The Scriptures were again read over with a watchful eye to their elasticity. New meanings were discovered for old texts, and doubtful readings were carefully adapted to the new movement. Meanwhile on came the mighty movement, ominous and terrible, threatening to overwhelm revealed religion with death and destruction. Agnosticism and destructive criticism were enlisted for the attack; but they were mere auxiliaries. The great central power—alike death-bearing and indomitable—was the doctrine of Darwinism or evolution by means of natural selection. This was the wonder of the age, the marvel of the nineteenth century, the crowning glory of science, compared with which the practical and industrial sciences, such as steam and electricity, were spoken of by speculative scientists in the language of measured scorn. "They were merely utilitarian." For fully a quarter of a century the new doctrine loomed up in gigantic proportions in the scientific world. It was the fetish of speculative science. It will be instructive to note briefly the suddenness of its rise and the greatness of its fall.

Should any one be inclined to regard such a task as superfluous, it is merely necessary to refer them to our current literature, from which it can be speedily learned that, at least in some quarters, faith in natural selection seems to be gaining ground in inverse ratio to its failure. In view of the glowing eulogies on Darwinism one reads nowadays, of the eloquent tributes to natural selection from living and deceased litterateurs, of the brilliant attempts to reconcile the Genesiac cosmogony—even to man's origin—with the origin of species by means of natural selection, and in view of the further fact that a profession of faith in natural selection is supposed to carry with it the strongest evidence of modernity, it is a somewhat perilous undertaking to go counter to the popular current in favor of Darwinism. It is, however, just twenty years since the late Professor Huxley, celebrating what he called "The Coming of Age of the Origin of Species," gave this wholesome admonition:

"History warns us that it is the customary fate of new truths to begin as heresies and to *end as superstitions* (italics ours), and as matters now stand, it is hardly rash to anticipate that in another twenty years the new generation, educated under the influences of the present day, will be in danger of accepting the main doctrines of the 'Origin of Species' *with as little reflection, and it may be with as little justification,* as so many of our contemporaries, twenty years ago, rejected them."

Twenty years have proved Professor Huxley to be a true prophet. The new generation is accepting the main doctrines of the "Origin of Species" with just "as little reflection" and just "as little justification" as Professor Huxley foretold they would; for, assuredly, if scepticism regarding natural selection has yielded to credulity, it is not owing to weight of evidence.

The notion of evolution had been floating about the world in one form or other from ancient times. It was, however, only towards the close of the last century, when the theory was propounded by Treviranus and Lamarck, that it began to seriously challenge the attention of scientists. Lamarck was a keen observer, and noticing that in the animal world organs became more fully developed by use and atrophied by disuse, he maintained that these characteristics of more fully developed or atrophied organs were transmissible to posterity. To this inheritance of organisms affected by use or disuse Lamarck attributed the variations from original types. In other words, the inheritance of organs modified by use or disuse held about the same place in Lamarck's theory of evolution that natural selection holds in the Darwinian hypothesis. "Floods of easy ridicule," as Professor Huxley tells us, "were poured" on Lamarck's theory; and though adopted by Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of the famous Charles, the doctrine of evolution dropped out of sight in the early part of the present century, drowned in the floods of ridicule poured on it by the scientists themselves. Little was heard of evolution for the next half century, until in 1859 "The Origin of Species" by means of natural selection strode into the arena, like Minerva full-armed from the brain of Jupiter. Science at once discovered in the new visitor the form and features of a god. It knelt down and worshiped. Mr. Wallace, the joint parent with Mr. Darwin of the prodigy, was, it is true, slightly overlooked in the distribution of honors, but Mr. Darwin received his full meed. The Darwinian hypothesis, as all the world now knows, was, to state the matter roughly, simply this: All species have been developed by variation from common stocks by means of the process of natural selection. This process is closely allied to artificial selection or what is commonly called selective breeding, the struggle for existence doing for natural selection what the human agency does for selective breeding.

The new doctrine was hailed with acclamations of joy from every quarter of the scientific world. Professor Huxley, as he himself tells us, acted in the capacity of "under-nurse" to the infant prodigy. Mr. Herbert Spencer hastened to offer his kind offices, and as the cognomen of "natural selection" was somewhat "caviare to the general," he suggested a substitute for it in "the survival of the fittest." Evolution filled not only the world of science, but all the rest of the world besides. Evolution was in the air. Its success was a foregone conclusion. It was to take its place alongside the great discoveries in physical science, greater than any of them, greater than all of them, greater than the heliocentric discovery, greater than the law of gravitation, while the names of Copernicus and Newton were to rank a degree lower than that of Charles Darwin. For more than a quarter of a century evolution with natural selection as its prime minister reigned supreme. Now it begins to lie like an incubus on all physical science, for, according to the very highest scientific authority, the evidence for natural selection has completely broken down.

To those who followed the divagations of natural selection for the last quarter of a century the doctrine of Darwinism had, about the middle of the last decade, ceased to be interesting, for the reason that it had ceased to be tenable. Just then there was a general commotion in the scientific world. Dogmatism suddenly ceased. An abandonment of position followed. Darwin himself had passed away. Professor Huxley was still living. Suddenly the world beheld the singular spectacle of the two foremost men of science, Mr. Herbert Spencer and the late Professor Huxley, abandoning for the moment the field of speculation and inquiry for the humiliating work of reparation and retraction. And what is more, to all appearances, both these renowned scientists entered upon this work after due deliberation and by concerted action. Repentance does not come easily to such spirits as Professor Huxley. He had too long indulged in his favorite pastime of intimidating religion to take easily to recantation. Indeed, Professor Huxley on the stool of repentance would rob the most picturesque character in the history of modern science of all its romance. Abject penitence was hardly to be expected of him. Nevertheless, while the proud, baffled spirit fought fiercely to the last, and the note of defiance would break out occasionally, even to the end, he was too great a lover of science to permit his name to go down to history as the supporter of a theory which he knew to be inconclusive, without sounding a note of warning to his followers. It is true that only once or twice does he speak in trumpet tones of unmistakable clearness on Darwinism itself; and that it is only when Mr. Herbert Spencer interprets for us the very strongest of them we apprehend its full significance; but his warnings to his disciples are plain, unmistakable and numerous.

With Mr. Herbert Spencer the case is entirely different. His retraction is made *ex professo.* As the Duke of Argyll put it at the time: "He goes himself into the confessional." He points out where his own theory of evolution as well as that of Mr. Darwin is defective, and for both he tries as best he can to substitute something more satisfactory. Whether he has succeeded in this is not the question here. The important point—which seems, however, to be universally overlooked—indeed, the only point worth considering, is the candid avowal that evolution by means of natural selection has been a failure. In the scramble to discover substitutes for the Darwinian hypothesis the utter failure of that hypothesis seems to be completely lost sight of. Natural selection is, in some quarters, talked of as glibly and as confidently as if it had triumphantly accomplished all it had promised. He would be a bold man who would say aught against it or against evolution; and that Mr. Herbert Spencer and the late Professor Huxley were reactionists from the famous theory needs conclusive proof. Fortunately the proof is easily furnished.

We have said that Professor Huxley was a reactionist from Darwinism, and this is true; but it is only half the truth. It sounds like the wildest of paradoxes to say that Professor Huxley was never a believer in the Darwinian hypothesis at all. Nevertheless it is but the simple truth. He was the coryphæus of the movement. He was its most eloquent and zealous advocate. In season and out of season he preached the doctrine. To him more than to any one else—more than to Mr. Spencer, more than to Professor Haeckel, more, even, than to Mr. Darwin himself—is due the wide popularity of the Darwinian hypothesis; and yet he never made a profession of faith in it to the end. Like some worshipers who are regular attendants at church services in one or other of the Protestant denominations all their lives long, but who never "join the church," subscribe to its doctrine, adopt its creed, or make a profession of faith in its tenets, Professor Huxley to the end was outside the Darwinian fold. He saw too clearly the shortcomings of natural selection from the very outset, and was, from the start, one of its keenest and most dangerous critics. Here are the facts:

The first edition of the "Origin of Species" appeared on November 24, 1859, and in the April of 1860 Professor Huxley contributed his first criticism of the work to the *Westminster Review,* in which he said:

"There is no fault to be found with Mr. Darwin's method, then; but it is another question whether he has fulfilled all the conditions imposed by that method. Is it satisfactorily proved, in fact, that species may be originated by selection? that there is such a thing as selection? that none of the phenomena exhibited by species are inconsistent with the origin of species in this way? If these questions can be answered in the affirmative, Mr. Darwin's view steps out of the rank of hypotheses into those of proved theories; *but so long as the evidence* (italics ours)[1] *at present adduced falls short of enforcing affirmation, so long, to our minds, must the new doctrine be content to remain among the former—an extremely valuable, and in the highest degree probable, doctrine, indeed the only extant hypothesis which is worth anything in a scientific point of view; but still a hypothesis, and not yet the theory of species.*"

This was Professor Huxley's first criticism on natural selection, written a few months after the publication of Mr. Darwin's famous work. In the same article Professor Huxley added:

"After much consideration, and with assuredly no bias against Mr. Darwin's views, it is our clear conviction that, *as the evidence now stands, it is not absolutely proven that a group of animals, having all the characters exhibited by species in Nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural.*"

Again, closing his objection drawn from the sterility of hybrids, he thus concludes:

"But still, as the case stands at present, this 'little rift within the lute' *is not to be disguised or overlooked.*"

And before closing his article he says:

"We have ventured to point out that it ('The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection') *does not, as yet, satisfy all those requirements.*" (The requirements of "scientific logic.")

Professor Huxley has, we think, left little room for doubt regarding the meaning of the foregoing extracts. They establish his position with regard to natural selection clearly. He had evidently the hope that one day the hypothesis might prove a demonstrated theory, but until that time, if a bull may be permitted, scepticism was his creed. It may, possibly, be urged that Professor Huxley changed his views as years went on, and that his scepticism was dispelled by the proofs which the next quarter of a century brought to light. He himself can best answer this question also. A short time before his death, in controversy with the Duke of Argyll, defending himself against the charge of being a reactionist in evolution, he took occasion to reiterate his faith, such as it was, in Darwinism, in connection with which he used those remarkable words:

---

[1] Italics throughout this article are ours, unless indicated otherwise.

"It is only a few weeks since I happened to read over again the first articles I ever wrote (now twenty-seven years ago) on the 'Origin of Species,' *and I found nothing that I wished to modify in the opinions that are there expressed*, though subsequent vast accumulation of evidence in favor of Mr. Darwin's views would give me much to add."

We have just seen what those views were in which, after twenty-seven years, he "found nothing to modify." During all that time an army of scientific inquirers had been industriously at work with natural selection as their watchword and evolution as their goal. The activity of the scientific world during these twenty-seven years is unparalleled in the history of science. Willing workers and anxious seekers in every department of speculative science—in natural history, in geology, in palæontology, in biology, in physiology, in morphology, in comparative anatomy, in the newer sciences of anthropology, embryology and synthetic chemistry—had but one end in view, one Eureka as their object, namely, the lifting of evolution by means of natural selection out of the rank of hypotheses and placing it securely in that of demonstrated theories; and yet at the close of that time Professor Huxley frankly admitted to the world that he had "nothing to modify" in an article in which he had deliberately consigned to the rank of mere "hypotheses" Darwin's doctrine of the evolution of species, in which he had openly declared that this doctrine had "not yet satisfied all the requirements of scientific logic," and in which he pointed out "the little rift within the lute" that was soon to make the music of that doctrine mute.

Strange as it may seem, then, there is no doubt that Professor Huxley never regarded the evolution of species as propounded by Mr. Darwin as a scientific truth at all. But, it may be asked, this being the case, why was he so strenuous an advocate of Darwinism, and why should there be need of reparation on his part? The same answer will suffice for both these questions. While he regarded it as of little value, inasmuch as it was merely an unproved hypothesis, he regarded it as of the utmost value as a provisional hypothesis, or, as he himself put it, "as an instrument of investigation." It might have no truth in it. It might never become a demonstrated theory; but as an incentive to inquiry, as a stimulus to research, as a guide in observation and experiment—in a word, as a good working hypothesis—he regarded it as unequaled. He did not hesitate to assert that it was far "superior to any preceding or contemporary hypothesis in the extent of observational and experimental basis on which it rests, in its rigorously scientific method and in its power of explaining biological phenomena." This was its value, or at least a portion of its value, in his estimation. A further value he thus explains:

"We should leave a very wrong impression on the reader's mind if we permitted him to suppose that the value of the work depends wholly on the ultimate justification of the theoretical views which it contains. On the contrary, if they were disproved to-morrow, the book would still be the best of its kind—the most compendious statement of well-sifted facts bearing on the doctrine of species that has ever appeared."

These were the qualities in the new doctrine which elicited his regard and enlisted his enthusiasm. This enthusiasm, indeed, he carried beyond all due limits. He expressed himself in such terms that his hearers and his readers were not to blame if they looked upon him as a firm believer in the truth of the doctrine itself. The disciples, taking the cue from the master, whose meaning they misunderstood, soon began to out-Herod Herod, until at last Mr. Spencer was forced to complain that "nowadays most naturalists are more Darwinian than Darwin himself." Professor Huxley's eyes were at last opened to the real situation, and hence the work of reparation and admonition. We shall quote two or three instances of Professor Huxley's penitential texts. In his history of "The Advance of Science Within the Last Half Century," referring to some of the advanced views in anthropology, he finds room for these pregnant words:

"Much of the speculative 'phylogeny' which abounds among my present contemporaries reminds me forcibly of the speculative morphology, unchecked by a knowledge of development, which was rife in my youth. As hypothesis, suggesting inquiry in this or that direction, it is often extremely useful; but, when the product of such speculation is placed on a level with those generalizations of morphological truths which are represented by the definitions of natural groups, *it tends to confuse fancy with fact, and to create mere confusion. We are in danger of drifting into a new 'Natur-Philosophie' worse than the old. Boyle did great service to science by his 'Sceptical Chemist,' and I am inclined to think that, at the present day, a 'Sceptical Biologist' might exert an equally beneficent influence.*"

Sceptical biologist indeed! But who, in these days of ultra-Darwinism, will tolerate a sceptical biologist? Nevertheless, it is well to remember that we have the salutary warning of the foremost biologist of his time against overmuch faith in the new anthropology.

Again, in one of his articles on "Science and Pseudo-science," Professor Huxley says:

"As is the case with all new doctrines, so with that of evolution: the enthusiasm of advocates has sometimes tended to degenerate into fanaticism, *and mere speculation has at times threatened to shoot beyond its legitimate bounds. I have occasionally thought it wise to warn the more adventurous spirits among us against these dangers in sufficiently plain language.*"

All of which unmistakably indicates "a change of heart" in Professor Huxley's later years from the days when he, too, was among the more adventurous spirits who seemed to think that speculation could not be carried too far and that its only legitimate boundary lines were the imagination. We shall let Mr. Herbert Spencer add one more of Professor Huxley's admonitions, perhaps the most significant of all of them. In his epilogue to "The Factors of Organic Evolution," Mr. Spencer thus quotes Professor Huxley:

"With these passages I may fitly join a remark made in the admirable address Professor Huxley delivered before unveiling the statue of Mr. Darwin in the museum at South Kensington. *Deprecating the supposition that an authoritative sanction was given by the ceremony to the current ideas concerning evolution, he said that 'science commits suicide when it adopts a creed.'* "

If language means anything, then Darwinism had, after a quarter of a century of trial, fallen into utter disrepute. The feet of the idol were found to be of clay after all. Dagon had fallen prone from the altar on which science had, a quarter of a century previous, so proudly placed him. Scientific men shrank from even the appearance of lending the dethroned idol their sanction or approval, and the consequence of their having been duped by the impostor was the utterance of the conviction that scientific creeds are dangerous things for men of science; which, put epigrammatically so as never to be forgotten, is "*science commits suicide when it adopts a creed.*" This was the bitter lesson taught Professor Huxley by meddling with the doctrine of the origin of species by natural selection. The full significance of this revolt will be understood when we remember that it is the same Professor Huxley who was once so enthusiastic an advocate of the new doctrine, who acted in the capacity, as he himself tells us, of "under-nurse" to the theory, who was the orator when it celebrated its coming of age, who was the chosen expounder of the doctrine on all public occasions, and who, even now, when a statue was being unveiled in honor of Mr. Darwin, was the orator by natural selection on the occasion; that it is the same Professor Huxley who now makes use of that occasion to stab the doctrine to the heart, and who goes even to the length of "deprecating the supposition that an authoritative sanction was given by the ceremony" to the doctrine of evolution by means of natural selection. Well might natural selection cry out *"Et tu Brute."*

It would be easy to adduce other proofs of Professor Huxley's attitude towards the doctrine; but we think enough has been said to show that we have not overstated the case when we said that Professor Huxley never made a profession of faith in the doctrine of natural selection at all, and that towards the close of his life he was engaged in the work of reparation by uttering warnings and admonitions to his followers. With Professor Huxley there was, as has been said, no occasion for retraction. He had never made an act of faith in the doctrine.

With Mr. Herbert Spencer the case was different. Not only had he openly avowed his faith in the efficacy of evolution as taught by Mr. Darwin, but he had even disputed with Mr. Darwin the honor of inventing it. Moreover, Mr. Darwin did not extend his generalization beyond the domain of biology, while Mr. Spencer not only extended it to the inorganic world, but endeavored to apply it to all psychical, social and political phenomena as well. For Mr. Darwin's "natural selection" he invented the Spencerian equivalent, "the survival of the fittest," and around this as a centre as many battles were waged as over the famous Darwinian phrase itself. Mr. Spencer's advocacy of evolution was not as enthusiastic as Professor Huxley's, but it was more positive and assertive; hence the need of retraction in his case. And it must be admitted that the recantation is clear, candid and ample.

In the year 1886 Mr. Spencer contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* two articles which could not fail to be epoch-making in the history of natural selection. They were entitled "The Factors of Organic Evolution." Whatever indirection there might have been in the method of announcement, the announcement itself was unmistakable. It was the confession that the dogmatism of a quarter of a century had been a mistake. "Natural selection" and "the survival of the fittest" were both inadequate to account for the origin of species. Mr. Spencer does not, like Professor Huxley, content himself with laying down a general principle or uttering oracular epigram. He at once plunges *in medias res.* He comes at once to particulars. He puts the question plainly, even bluntly: Has "natural selection" succeeded? In the very first sentence of his first article he makes a clean breast of the whole matter. The article opens thus:

"While recognizing in full the process brought into clear view by Mr. Darwin, and traced out by him with so much care and skill, *we may fitly ask whether those are right who conclude that, taken alone, it* *accounts for organic evolution? Has the natural selection of favorable variations been the sole factor, as it is now commonly supposed to have been?*"

And his answer comes promptly:

"On critically examining the evidence, we shall find reason to think that *it by no means explains all that has to be explained.*"

Mr. Spencer immediately adds what he believes must be regarded as a necessary supplemental factor:

"Unless that increase of a part resulting from extra activity and that decrease of it resulting from inactivity are transmissible to descendants, *we are without a key to many phenomena of organic evolution.*"

To those who had pinned their faith to Darwin and Spencer and who had long regarded, on the authority of these scientists, evolution as the solution of all biological and even of all cosmical problems, this announcement came like a thunder-clap from a serene sky. What did it mean? That natural selection and the survival of the fittest had been failures? Of a surety this and nothing else. Mr. Spencer asks the question plainly: Does "natural selection" account for organic evolution? And he answers without hesitation that, on critical examination, "it by no means explains all that has to be explained;" that it leaves us "without a key to many phenomena of organic evolution." Nay, what is more, recognizing this utter failure of "natural selection" to "explain all that has to be explained," he at once casts about for some other means of explanation; and, strange to say, of all others, he selects as a worthy coadjutor of natural selection the effete hypothsis of Lamarck, which, as we have seen, was, about the beginning of the century, rejected by the scientists with scorn and drowned in floods of ridicule. This obsolete doctrine he rakes up from the rubbish of a past age, tries to galvanize it into new life and places it as the head of the corner. He tells us in cold print that while "the hypothesis of the inheritance of functionally produced modifications" (the Lamarck theory) is "utterly inadequate to explain the major part of the facts, . . . yet there is a minor part of the facts, *very extensive though less, which must be ascribed to this cause.*" He then proceeds to describe three classes of difficulties which cannot be explained by natural selection, but "which disappear if the inherited effects of use and disuse are recognized."

Whether Mr. Spencer makes good his contention regarding the solution of those different classes of difficulties by the rehabilitated factor does not come within the scope of this article. All that is necessary here is merely to recognize the fact—too often lost sight of—that Mr. Spencer has recorded in the strongest way his loss of faith in natural selection and the survival of the fittest as a solution of the problem of evolution. This is all the more remarkable, too, coming from Mr. Spencer at a time of life when, as he himself once said about Mr. Darwin, "the natural tendency is towards fixity of opinion;" and coming from Mr. Spencer, of all others, for whom the failure of evolution is equivalent to drawing the pencil of cancelation throughout the pages of his colossal life work. But this is not all. Mr. Spencer, having entered on the work of demolition, pursues it unrelentingly to the end. He has shown the failure of the Darwinian theory of natural selection "to explain all that has to be explained," and he has supplemented it by the Lamarckian theory of the inherited effects of use and disuse, as a necessary auxiliary. But he does not stop here. He tells us that even both these together are inadequate to explain all the facts; that there is still need of a third. And he tells us this quite as bluntly as he told us there was need of a second. Here is how he puts the question:

"But now, supposing the broad conclusion above drawn to be granted—supposing all to agree that from the beginning, along with inheritance of useful variations fortuitously arising (the Darwinian theory), there has been inheritance of effects produced by use and disuse (the Lamarckian theory), *do there remain no classes of phenomena unaccounted for?*"

And, as before, the answer comes promptly and unhesitatingly:

"To this question I think it must be replied that *there do remain classes of organic phenomena unaccounted for.* It may, I believe, be shown that *certain cardinal traits of animals and plants at large are still unexplained.*"

Well might the devout evolutionist exclaim: "Mercy on us! What is going to happen next? Has catastrophism not only reasserted itself, but overtaken the doctrine of evolution, too?" For the world had been filled with the resounding echoes of Darwinism. It was to account for everything. It had just begun to be regarded as almighty and irrefragable. And just in the supreme moment of its exaltation the foremost living evolutionist suddenly calls a halt and declares it an ignominious failure. Nor were Mr. Spencer's reasons for his abrupt interruption of the apotheosis of Darwinism calculated to reassure the ardent evolutionists. Important and far-reaching as were Mr. Spencer's articles, they were still more significant in the spirit that prompted them. He told the world plainly that the articles were written for the express purpose of stemming the tide of credulity. What could be stronger than these words?

"Along with larger motives, one motive which has joined in promoting the foregoing articles has been the desire to point out that already among biologists *the beliefs concerning the origin of species* *have assumed too much the character of a creed.* . . . There seems occasion for recognizing the warning uttered by Professor Huxley as not uncalled for."

The warning here referred to as coming from Professor Huxley was that already quoted, in which he said that "science commits suicide when it adopts a creed." And Mr. Spencer concludes his remarkable articles—perhaps the most memorable articles on the subject since Mr. Darwin's "Origin of Species" appeared forty-one years ago—with these pregnant words:

"Whatever may be thought of the arguments in this article and the preceding one, they will perhaps serve to show that *it is as yet too soon to close the inquiry concerning the causes of organic evolution.*"

We have called these articles of Mr. Spencer's a work of reparation and retraction, and we think that, as in the case of Professor Huxley, we have here, too, made good our claim. Coming as they did from the foremost of living evolutionists, they produced immediately a profound impression in the scientific world. The tide of opinion at once began to turn from the belief in natural selection as the sole cause of evolution, and scientists began to cast about for new factors to take its place, since that had proved inadequate. The revolt of Professor Huxley with that of Mr. Spencer, and, to all appearances, according to a mutual understanding, shook the doctrine of natural selection to its very centre, and the temples of the long-cherished idol were soon destitute of worshipers. Of the vast multitude that fifteen years ago bent the knee before Darwinism as the true and only deity of the scientific world, perhaps not more than two of any note—Professor Weismann and Dr. Romanes—have maintained the faith in natural selection pure and unadulterated—if, indeed, panmixia and special determinants can be conceived as non-adulterating. Some have openly repudiated the doctrine altogether and adopted the inheritance of functionally produced modifications as their creed instead. Others, still, profess a sort of divided faith, acknowledging a sort of dual divinity as supreme in the evolutional world. This amphibious deity is part Darwinian and part Lamarckian, for it is a combination of "natural selection" and the "inheritability of functional modifications." Outside of these anarchy reigns supreme. The tendency is towards independent views. Each scientist shows an inclination to set up his own little Bethel for himself. Hence we have not only panmixia, which is, to be sure, only an offshoot of natural selection, and determinate evolution or orthogenesis as it is called; we have not only the "isolation" resulting in "monotypic evolution" and the "isolation" resulting in "polytypic evolution," besides the "physiological selection" recently elaborated by Dr. Romanes; but Mr. Spencer, himself not dismayed or disheartened by the failure of the survival of the fittest, has undertaken to find new factors for evolution. He had adopted natural selection under the cognomen of survival of the fittest; but found, as we have seen, that "it by no means explains all that is to be explained." Next he supplemented natural selection by "the inheritance of functionally produced modifications," and still, again, found that there remained "many classes of organic phenomena unaccounted for." He then introduced a third factor, which he called "the direct action of the medium"—using the word medium—as including "all physical forces falling upon them (living organisms) as well as matters bathing them." But Mr. Spencer had already opened wide the floodgates of revolution. Rebellion is now in the air. The humblest scientist refuses longer to call any man master. Regard for high authority, so long sacred and so edifyingly carried out towards Mr. Darwin and his scientific offspring, has fled the school of evolution. Lawlessness reigns supreme. Mr. Spencer sowed the dragon's teeth, and he has lived to witness and bear the dire results. And so when he tries to raise his voice above the din and confusion no one listens, or, if they do, it is but to question and argue as if with one without authority. Indeed, a special creationist—supposing a specimen of the extinct race still left upon the earth—beholding Darwinism dethroned, natural selection a mere *magni nominis umbra*, anarchy and chaos supreme in the world of evolution, might well believe that retributive justice had at last overtaken his once proud oppressor and that all the woes and tribulations of his brethren were being amply avenged.

So far we have seen Professor Huxley's revolt against the doctrine of natural selection. We have seen how Mr. Spencer first adopted the doctrine, found it insufficient, then how, instead of promptly rejecting it, he undertook to strengthen it by introducing the hypothesis of adaptive changes, as one undertakes to strengthen a flawed timber by adventitious methods. We have seen, from Mr. Spencer's own confession, how both these together, still showing structural weakness, he was obliged to buttress them by a third—the direct action of the medium. This piece of evolutionary engineering took place in 1886, fourteen years ago. It is interesting and instructive to inquire how the doctrine has fared during that period. Up to that time there was unity of faith throughout the world of evolution. The creed was one, the discipline was one, the worship was one. No one had been rash enough to question the divinity of the scientific deity, much less to dare lay sacrilegious hands upon it. But in an evil hour Mr. Spencer unveiled the prophet and laid bare its infirmities to the scientific world. Disunion and dissension naturally ensued. Evolution, following its own law of variation, has branched out into many varieties—so many, indeed, that it would not be at all surprising to find it in its own personality cutting the gordian knot and solving the sphinx's riddle for good and all by originating a new species. It would be a profitless task to follow out the different varieties into which evolution has evolved itself. The main branch is still that advocated by Mr. Spencer. Mr. Spencer still stands without a rival in the school of evolution, and we shall follow him as still by far the ablest exponent of the doctrine. Meanwhile, however, we must not forget the fact that there is no longer a theory of natural selection ruling far and wide, arbitrarily and autocratically exclusive, as in the days before the revolt. Not even in the Neo-Darwinian school of evolution is natural selection regarded as a competent cause of evolution without support of some kind. Before examining the main branch of the doctrine held by Mr. Spencer let us inquire into the fate of natural selection within the last decade.

Since Mr. Spencer's revolt against the once famous doctrine he has been fiercely assailed and an internecine warfare has ensued. In the strife Mr. Spencer has done irreparable damage to the cause of which he was once so staunch a supporter. The cause of natural selection has received at his hands many bloody wounds—some of them even fatal. Indeed, all that is necessary in order to see how utterly natural selection has broken down is to read Mr. Spencer's portion of the controversy with the Neo-Darwinians during the last six or seven years. The enemies of natural selection need go no further than Mr. Spencer's recent writings for the most deadly weapons against the hypothesis that had once come to be looked upon as impregnable. Mr. Spencer found himself in two somewhat difficult rôles. In the first place he found himself in the awkward position of assailant and defender of natural selection at one and the same time; hence it was inevitable that he should give it some ugly stabs. Then we find that without wholly discarding natural selection he took to himself a new favorite in the inheritance of functionally produced modifications, and in the clashing claims of the two favorites the old one received at his hands scant courtesy. Hence we find him referring to natural selection as "the fashionable hypothesis." We hear his sharp retort to the Neo-Darwinians that "*they admit that there is no direct proof that any species has been established by natural selection.*" He tartly tells them that in certain cases he rejects natural selection because "*When to uncertainties in the arguments supporting the hypothesis we add its inability to explain facts of cardinal significance,*" he is compelled to do so. And he enumerates three distinct classes of problems—the coadaptation of coöperative parts, the possession of unlike powers of discrimination by different parts of the human skin and the question of rudimentary organs—where natural selection utterly fails, and sums up by saying, "Failure to solve any one of these problems would, I think, alone prove the Neo-Darwinian doctrines untenable; and the fact that we have *three* (italics Mr. Spencer's) unsolved problems seems to me to be fatal." With this parting blow from Mr. Spencer, we think Natural Selection—-once written with capitals—may safely be left in the hands of its friends as incapable of further good or evil. We can now turn to the examination of evolution in Mr. Spencer's own hands.

Mr. Spencer's new gospel of evolution is, as we have seen, a species of eclecticism. It is indeed a strange conglomerate of species grafted on species, adaptive changes grafted on natural selection and the direct action of the medium grafted on both. It is, indeed, possible that the weakness of the Darwinian hypothesis and the weakness of the Lamarckian hypothesis when put together make for strength, but it is not quite reassuring to find that this strength Mr. Spencer finds it necessary to buttress by a third hypothesis admittedly no stronger than either. In fact, there seems to be a little danger that the doctrine of evolution may prove to be something of a monstrosity, inasmuch as it seems to be developing heads as rapidly as the Lernæan hydra. For first we had at least a symmetric doctrine in natural selection, whatever else it might be wanting in. But natural selection being lopped off, two other heads instantly spring up in its place, and every new excision seems to develop another and still another. A quarter of a century ago Mr. Spencer seemed to be a firm believer that natural selection was sufficient to account for all biological phenomena. To-day he stoutly insists that not one, but three are necessary, and even shows a willingness to look with some degree of favor on still other coadjutors, such as isolation, physiological selection, etc. The question, therefore, naturally arises: how has Mr. Spencer's experiment succeeded? If in a multitude of counsellors there is much wisdom, in a multiplicity of factors we might expect some solvent potency. But Mr. Spencer does not seem to be any nearer the solution of the problem evolution started out to solve than when he attempted the solution by means of natural selection alone.

The inquirer cannot fail to be struck by several strange features of Mr. Spencer's new formula of evolution. We shall briefly call attention to five, the first and last being especially striking. The first of these is its openly acknowledged failure. We ask: With all these new factors is the problem solved? Does evolution at last explain all that is to be explained? And Mr. Spencer still answers: No. He candidly, as before, says: *"But now let it be confessed there* *remain many unsolved problems.*" And as if to impress us with the fact still more strongly, he adds: "*Thus the process of evolution is far from being understood.*" This then is the result after forty-one years of trial with not only natural selection as a key, but with whatever else scientific ingenuity could devise by way of new hypotheses. In this year of grace, 1900, it is again confessed that with all modern appliances and after countless attempts "many problems remain unsolved," and that "the process of evolution is far from being understood."

We have said that the first and last features of Mr. Spencer's new theory of evolution are especially striking; but in some respects the second is the most striking of all. It is nothing more or less than the attempt to "ignore" the distinctions of species as mere "technical ideas" and merely "incidental phenomena." But one asks naturally: Was not this the question precisely which evolution started out to solve? the all-important question? And scientists can only reply: Yes, it was the question of questions. Indeed, in the face of the agitation of the last half century scientists cannot answer otherwise. What, then, must be thought of this latest variation of evolution? One reads a second and a third time to be sure that his senses do not deceive him. Desperate indeed must be the cause which is forced to fly to such a refuge. To solve a problem by ignoring it altogether as merely technical is indeed the newest feat in the scientific world; but what, when this is the problem on which the whole question at issue hinges, indeed when it is the problem of problems itself? As we expect to return to this question later on, we may pass to the third feature to which we wish to call attention. It is this:

The process of evolution was to be strictly scientific. Science admitted nothing in the way of explanation which did not fall within the sphere of our conceptions. Conceivability Mr. Spencer himself set up as the test of truth. Whatever did not fall within the limits of conceivability was to be rigorously excluded. This was why special creation was so summarily ejected. It introduced an inconceivable element into its account of phenomena, and this science could never abide much in the same way as Mistress Quickly tells of Falstaff that "A could never abide carnation." But now Mr. Spencer tells us quite candidly that the theory of adaptive changes which he has formally installed as a coadjutor to natural selection, and without which he tells us "an extensive part of the phenomena cannot be explained," is not conceivable in thought at all. The process, he admits, is wholly inconceivable. In plain words he says: "At last, then, we are obliged to admit that the actual organizing process transcends conception. It is not enough to say that we cannot know it; we must say that we cannot even conceive it." Nevertheless, dispensing himself from the rigorous test he imposed on others, he introduces the theory of adaptive changes. Yet even with this explanation, which is inconceivable, and with the distinction of species—the main problem—thrown in, he tells us still that "there remain many unsolved problems." The fourth feature to which we wish to call attention is but a corollary of the third. Mr. Spencer, finding the theory of adaptive changes inconceivable, yet loath to part with it, undertakes to symbolize it, and what is even worse the symbolic conceptions of it which he undertakes to introduce belong to what he himself has long since designated as "the illegitimate order;" that is to say, they belong to that class upon which, in religion, Mr. Spencer has over and over again pronounced anathema. Now, however, fronting the difficulty of solving problems which are insoluble by conceivable processes, he takes refuge in the very method which he has so severely censured. Finding that the process of adaptive changes is inconceivable, that here "imagination, whatever license may be given, utterly fails us," he concludes: "Thus all we can do is to find some way of symbolizing the process so as to enable us most conveniently to generalize its phenomena." In other words, he adopts precisely what he condemned special creation for adopting and recalls the method which he visited with Anathema Maranatha. And yet with all this he admits "there remain many unsolved problems." But this is not all.

The fifth and last feature to which we will direct attention remains to be seen. We have seen how science started out to solve the problem offered by phenomena in general, or, if you prefer it that way, by biological phenomena in particular, by means of natural selection alone, and, according to the testimony of the evangelists of natural selection, how egregiously it has failed. We saw how it then asked to be permitted to use as an additional key to the problem the theory of adaptive changes, and how there was still failure. We saw how a third key was added with no better results; residual phenomena there remained still which yielded to no solvent. We saw how various other factors were called in to assist in the solution, with failure still as the result. We saw how, in its desperation, science then attempted to throw out the very question at issue—the origin of species—but that even still many kinds of phenomena remained unaccounted for. We saw how science did not scruple even to adopt unscientific methods and transgressed its own canons by introducing inconceivable processes where legitimate scientific methods failed; but yet with no better success. We saw how as a last resort it betook itself—like Macbeth to the weird sisters—to "symbolic conceptions of the illegitimate order," of which it had expressed so dread an abhorrence; and still here failure is written in glaring characters over the broad face of evolution. And now with the solution of one portion of the phenomena claimed by one hypothesis, with the solution of another extensive portion of the phenomena claimed by two antagonistic hypotheses, and with a large realm of the phenomena yet unaccounted for by any hypothesis, we are further told that the mysteries which science started out to solve by means of evolution remain with us as mysteries still. We are no better off than when we set out. We are not a single step in advance of special creation. We have mysteries as numerous and perplexing as before. Mr. Spencer tells us life is a mystery. Its origin is a mystery. There is a mystery in its functions. There is an inconceivable element in its workings. Mr. Spencer is in a quandary as to whether he can hope that the mystery will one day be solved, or whether "We must conclude that since life itself proves to be in its ultimate nature inconceivable, there is probably an inconceivable element in its workings" also. "What then are we to say—what are we to think?" Mr. Spencer asks. And he answers: "Simply that in this direction, as in all other directions, our explanations finally bring us face to face with the inexplicable. The ultimate reality behind this manifestation, as behind all other manifestations, transcends conception. It needs but to observe how even simple forms of existence are in their ultimate natures incomprehensible to see that this most complex form of existence is in a sense doubly incomprehensible."

This then is the last word of evolution. The mystery which it set out to solve remains a mystery still. The flourish of trumpets was a false alarm. The science that condemned religion because of symbol and mystery finds itself in turn forced to fall back on symbol and mystery in the last resort. But why symbol and mystery should be regarded as intolerable in religion where they are rational and logical, while they are regarded as desirable in science, where they are illogical and absurd, is one of the paradoxes which, like some biological phenomena, defy all explanation. But this may be passed over here. The matter of deepest import is that, according to the very highest authority on the question of evolution, evolution by means of natural selection has utterly failed. And as evolution by means of natural selection has been the only theory of evolution which has ever been regarded by the world at large as worth considering, it follows that there is no theory of evolution before the world that is worth a single moment's consideration. Mr. Spencer's disproof of natural selection as a competent cause of evolution threw the subject back a full century—to Lamarck's time. And the admission that the theory of adaptive changes cannot account for all the facts, and further, that natural selection and adaptive changes taken together—even with the addition of all the new-fangled doctrines—cannot account for all the facts, leaves the doctrine of evolution in any sense utterly baseless.

Every one knows that when a man undertakes a piece of work which he does not succeed in accomplishing he has simply failed. When he undertakes to solve a problem by certain means, and after repeated attempts tells us that much is left yet which cannot be satisfactorily accounted for, we do not hesitate to pronounce his attempted solution a failure. If the method he adopted has been properly applied the failure evidently lies in the method. We do not see why scientists should be treated with greater indulgence than their fellow-men, or why their methods should be entitled to larger exemptions. The evolutionists undertook boldly to solve the problem offered by phenomena and dismissed with contempt all previous attempts at solution. They challenged the world to come and witness the solution of the puzzle. The world stood by breathless to see the miracle. Science was to solve the riddle by natural means. We were to be shown that there was no mystery, nothing supernatural at all. The scientific magician approached the work. The necromancer was evolution with natural selection as his magic wand. The whole merit, however, lay in the fact that the process was not magical or supernatural at all; it was simply natural—scientific. All the world looked on intently while the wizard performed the wondrous feat. The wizard—evolution by means of natural selection—tries; fails. It tries again; fails again. It tries repeatedly; fails repeatedly. It asks to be allowed other means; they are granted. It tries again; again fails. It requests to be allowed still other means. Again granted—again failure. Again another means is requested, and another and another. They are all permitted; failure each time. It begs to throw out the whole central problem, which is almost the entire problem. It does so; still failure. It requests permission to use means which it loudly condemned in its competitors. Granted; failure once more. Illegitimate symbolic conceptions? Can they not be permitted, just for a trial? They are introduced—failure as great as before. Realms of facts are still unaccounted for; mysteries as inscrutable as before remain. In real life the necromancer would be hissed off the stage; in science we call it success.

Indeed, the world owes a debt of gratitude to Mr. Spencer for his unconscious aid in unmasking the impostor. He has thus in a measure atoned for the colossal folly of the Synthetic Philosophy. In spite of all his faults, Mr. Spencer is still the brightest intellect in the English-speaking world of speculative science, and it is something that he has lived to cancel some of his mistakes. Certainly no one has pointed out more clearly than he the utter failure of evolution by means of natural selection. The best that can be said of evolution as it stands before the world to-day is that it is but a pieced, patched, botched theory; that even so it fails to account for all the facts it undertook to explain; that it has already abandoned all hope of being able to explain them in the future, and that to the eternal disgrace of science it is forced to take refuge in symbol and mystery. For the honor of true science the more quickly it were decently buried out of sight the better. One begins to understand why so many eminent French scientists have steadfastly refused to lend countenance to the doctrine. It is not altogether, as Mr. Spencer opines, owing to the surviving influence of Cuvier. Everlasting fame is yet awaiting the scientist who can give to the world a satisfactory theory of evolution. Can it be done? Meanwhile in our schools, colleges and universities pupils are wading through the deeps and shallows of ignorance, vainly imagining they are studying science. What is glibly called science is what Professor Huxley twenty years ago called "superstition."

In view of the admissions of the scientists themselves, may it not be pertinently asked: Would not so many of our learned and distinguished Catholic professors be more profitably employed—not only from a religious, but even from a scientific standpoint—in examining the evidence for evolution than in trying to force its acceptance on the world? One longs for even a brief season of the late Dr. Brownson's vigorous and healthy thinking.

In the foregoing pages we have shown the failure of evolution by means of natural selection from the testimony of the scientists themselves. This failure can be even more conclusively demonstrated by a critcal examination of the doctrine in the light of the forty-one years during which it has been before the world. This, however, will require another article.

S. Fitzsimons.

Lima, N. Y.

THE LABORER AND HIS POINT OF VIEW.

DISORDERS among laboring men and conflicts between them and their employers have become so frequent of late that no one who is interested in public welfare has remained indifferent. Those who are not parties to the issues—at least not directly—may be roughly divided into two classes: the unthinking many and the thinking few. The former class read the newspapers, perhaps the magazines; they form opinions readily, express them freely. As they think without adequate information and speak without reflection, they unintentionally mislead others and obscure the real nature of the industrial problem. The thinking few devote themselves to careful study; they recognize the reign of law and the working of complex and subtle causes in the industrial situation. They have done much to force the question to the front; to win attention from all classes of society. Laborers themselves, no doubt, deserve most credit for actually forcing the world to study conditions; but earnest students and writers have aided to a marked degree.

The situation merits attention. A great class of our population, numbering millions, is being slowly isolated; gradually acquiring a consciousness, an individuality by which they are distinguished from other classes of society. Were the isolation of a kind which bears merely on secondary phases of social life, there need be no alarm. But it is an isolation regarding the fundamentals of our national and industrial organization. Laborers now seem to constitute a real industrial class. Their interests are regarded by them as distinct from those of professional classes and antagonistic to those of the employer and the wealthy classes. Laborers have taken a position in the industrial world which clearly reveals that isolation. They are rapidly acquiring—we may say they have acquired—the characteristics of a political class. As laborers they foster a distinctive view of our institutions and political ideals; they have a peculiar view of the functions of government and of its possibilities; there is a conscious though heretofore unsuccessful effort to reduce those views to a platform and construct thereon a labor party. Laborers constitute a distinct social class. Their tastes, judgments, enjoyments, their plane of life, ambition and aspiration are peculiar to themselves. One can scarcely come in touch with laboring men without detecting evidences of this threefold isolation. Naturally, the line of demarcation in each case is wavering; it is vague between all social classes. But that there is a decided tendency in the direction indicated seems indisputable. As a great ship lies quietly in the harbor, surrounded by a forest of masts and vessels of all sizes and kinds, its appearance suggests repose as we note the easy grace of its restful swaying in the water. But once it is in motion seaward, it is transformed. Grace, majesty, power are revealed in every movement. The laboring class has cut anchor; it is moving, and there is power, determination, purpose in every step.

This isolation of the laboring class is a vital question for modern society. It is in apparent contradiction with our accepted social ideals, and even with their current interpretation. Yet it is the expected product of our philosophy and institutions, historically considered. Then, again, the solution of the problems implied, constitutes a vital test of our institutions, our civilization and its possibilities. The situation in the industrial world cannot be tolerated. If we meet it successfully the triumph of popular government was never before so complete, so glorious. If we fail, our institutions will have failed of their fundamental purpose and the socialist will have been a prophet with a mission. The times are indeed solemn.

Events such as those seen in recent times in Chicago, St. Louis, Idaho and the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania show that at present neither our philosophy nor our institutions nor recognized social authority is equal to the situation. Contests concerning property rights and human rights; concerning court jurisdiction and the interpretation of fundamental laws; concerning even the power of our chief executives to employ the militia, are of frequent occurrence; and experience gained in one disturbance is of no use whatever, except to those to whose complaints the disturbances are due. There are contests every day concerning similar rights and powers. But they are orderly, peaceful and constructive. The contests referred to, however, are public, marked by great bitterness and suppressed hate; they result in no triumph of law, contribute in no way to upbuild our institutions. They are merely contests of endurance—attempts to settle by force what law has failed to determine rationally. Such disturbances, known as strikes, are only incidents in the whole situation. A battle, rather a campaign, supposes organization and armies. Out beyond the local limits of a particular strike there is going on among laborers the process of class isolation and organization. Organized they are capable of self direction, aggressive action and even revolution. It is this phase of the situation which merits most attention.

The facts in the social situation of the laboring class as the laborer sees them are fairly well known to all who care to learn them. Low wages, long hours, uncertainty of work, total dependence for living upon the property owner, diversified oppression of laborers by fines, methods of payment and company stores; wives, mothers and children competing with fathers and brothers; limited opportunity of elevation, culture or happiness. But statements of fact never contain the whole fact. Employers look upon the situation and see little if any difficulty; the general public looks and is scarcely more than interested; the laborer looks, sees himself as part of the situation and he is stirred, thrilled, aroused. The most marked result of the laborer's view is the trade union. It proclaims itself as the prophet of a new gospel, the teacher of new ethical interpretations to society, of a new conception of human dignity; for it teaches that man, and not property, should be the basis of all social organization. In this thought there is revolution, and the laborers know it.

Observing this process of class isolation and noting the history, methods and mistakes of the labor movement, one can scarcely fail to be struck by the phenomena there seen. Unselfishness abundant, yet much gross selfishness to be seen; order, pity and conservatism by the side of cruelty and lawlessness; quick command of reserve force, yet pathetic inability to avoid excess in action; clear grasp of principles and astonishing blindness to the limitations of circumstance and relation to which all social principles are necessarily subject.

It seems to be worth while to study the situation from the laborer's point of view; to attempt to see with his eyes, hear with his ears, judge with his mind. It may aid us in dealing with him to find out what are his standards, his ideals, his views. This essay is an attempt to accomplish that purpose. *The study may be made independently of the truth or falsehood of the laborer's assumptions.* We must aim to know what are his feelings or convictions without testing the premises or examining the validity of the process by which his view has been established. The task is not easy. The sources from which the information must be drawn are of varying value. It is difficult to determine whether or not a labor leader actually represents the views of the laborers at large; it is not easy to say how far the labor press reflects opinions and views accurately or how far it influences laboring men in the formation of their views. It is impossible to determine how far the sweeping preamble to the constitution of a labor union, voted unanimously, does contain the settled sentiment of a mass of men rather than the expression of momentary enthusiasm. Yet it is to the labor leader, the labor press, the labor convention that we must go for much information.[1] A census of individual laboring men, with generalizations based thereon, would not prove more reliable or free from error. As a rule a man is not fully conscious of his real mental attitude. How much unconscious feeling or force there may be given in a deliberate process we know only when we are tested. This is shown by our general lack of control in enthusiasm or dejection. When a laborer is consciously half socialist, *e. g.*, a crisis may provoke latent feeling or energy and he will talk or act fully a socialist. On the other hand, a crisis might cause him to appear as a conservative, his half socialism not standing the test. Yet if we ask him his views they will correspond to neither course of action. The labor movement may in a way be compared to the half socialist who when tested acts and speaks fully a socialist. Not that I yet call the movement socialistic. In a crisis such as a strike, general or local, when laborers have a serious grievance, when feelings are aroused for any reason whatsoever, we find invariably that certain views come to general expression. They are uniformly extreme views, but I believe them to be a power and a prophecy; a power in furnishing the basis of protest, organization and immediate action; a prophecy because the view which to-day is extreme and rare may to-morrow be widely shared; the view which requires a crisis to call it to expression now, may to-morrow be the ordinary view of the mass. Such being the case, it seems best to expose the extreme view first, then to indicate modifications which appear. The discriminating reader will be able to understand why the exposition is suggestive rather than exhaustive; he will understand, too, that when it is stated that a given element is found in the laborer's view, the statement implies that the laborer or many laborers actually share that view, or are rapidly gravitating toward it. The exposition cannot be more accurate than its sources.

---

[1] Reports of legislative committees and of Bureaus of Labor are also useful in a study like this.

For three generations our laboring men have been taught that government exists for all the governed; that sovereignty resides in the people; that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Gifted only with a natural logic, the laborer is inclined at times to take these guarantees literally, positively, in a sense possibly which was not consciously intended by the writers of the Declaration of Independence. Were conditions uniformly prosperous there might be no complaint. But there is widespread discontent; the laborer compares the achievements of government with its professed purpose, and he concludes that as regards him government is a failure. The right to life, he feels, is not adequately protected. Courts, laws of evidence, jury, procedure, etc., are cleverly devised to protect the citizen against possible murder or assault, but there is neither court nor jury nor procedure to protect a laborer against society when its institutions force him to starve. It is nowhere written in our books of law that a man shall be guaranteed the opportunity to earn a dignified livelihood in a becoming manner. Life means to the laborer more than physical existence, but the law fails to see how much more is meant. Even that physical existence, he thinks, is not always adequately protected. Necessity forces him to work, to accept the conditions in which work is offered. Unsanitary conditions often undermine health, overwork saps life energy, over exposure brings on disease, all of which may be as deadly as a revolver or the assassin's club. Yet the guarantee against these attacks on life in the laborer is still inadequate; it was unknown until laborers forced government to act. Again, life in the laborer's children is not protected. They enter the factory prematurely and growth is stunted, health impaired. Conditions make the home cheerless and unsanitary. Then children are often consecrated to vice before they know virtue, victims of disease before they had health, doomed to despair before they knew of hope. Life means to the laborer all that is there implied. When, then, the mason or the mechanic realizes this; when he leaves his comfortless home, "looking for a job," when he walks day after day and mile after mile in the vain search; when his bed is, perhaps, a newspaper spread on the floor of a depot waiting room; when hundreds, even thousands, of laborers have experienced more or less of what is here outlined, they feel that there is a cynical note in the protection which government gives to life. Quite often a hungry laborer will actually commit a misdemeanor in order to be arrested and placed in jail. He knows that while in jail he will be fed. The following, taken from an "Eight-Hour Primer" issued some years ago by the American Federation of Labor, expresses the situation accurately from the workingman's point of view. It is in the form of question and answer:

Q. What do you want?

A. Work.

Q. What do you want work for?

A. So I may live.

Q. You are living now; what more do you want?

A. I want to have a good deal better living. Sometimes I am hungry and I want food; I am getting ragged and I want better clothes. I sometimes have to sleep outdoors, and I want a regular and comfortable place to sleep. I am treated like a dog; I want to be treated like a man. I hate the present, and I dread the future. I shall soon be desperate and become criminal or careless and become a hardened tramp.

Q. Why don't you work?

A. I can't get work at any price.

Q. Why can't you get work?

A. Because no one will employ me.

The laborer believes that the guarantee of liberty is futile. In his philosophy of life, political, economic and social liberty merge into one. Formal differences are not always soothing when material conditions are painful. The laborer believes that economically he is a slave. He is not a party to the wages contract; his liberty in the supreme act of his temporal life, fixing wages and conditions of work, is, in fact, not protected by law. Even in his acts as a citizen he feels that he is hampered. Formerly men were told directly how they were to vote. The law now guarantees secrecy of ballot, but intimidation is still effective. The threat to close the factory or shops unless Smith or Jones is elected serves its purpose. A few days before the recent election a prominent railroad official announced that he had just placed an order for 9,000 cars; but that it would be rescinded unless a certain candidate for the Presidency were elected. This may have been well meant; that it tended to intimidate the laborers concerned is certain. The law recognizes in the laborer the right to organize, yet employers can and do at times effectively prevent laboring men from exercising that right by refusing to employ or threatening to discharge them if they belong to labor unions.

The equality which our institutions are supposed to foster is likewise found by the laborer to be only a vain promise. He believes that neither economically nor politically nor socially is he the equal of his fellow-citizens. He believes that our social organization rests on the idea of property rather than man, hence that they who have no property are in fact not the equals of those who have. Since opportunity depends largely on property, there is not equality as regards opportunity. Neither is there, in taking advantage of legal protection of common rights. There is so much time and money required "to go to law" that laborers quite generally look to law for no assistance. A laborer stated to the Senate committee which investigated the relations of labor and capital in 1884: "We expect no protection at all from the law as a general rule, because it is so expensive that we cannot take advantage of it."[2] Other ways in which the laborer's interpretation of equality is violated will occur to the reader. It is quite natural, then, that the pursuit of happiness, a thought fundamental to our institutions, is regarded as practically closed to the laborer. Happiness for him would be found in the margin of life wider than mere existence; in education, culture, happy home life, with children surrounded by safe, healthy protection. But the conditions actually force him into a home that is cheerless, his labor exhausts him, his children are drawn into the stream of industrial activity by forces beyond him. Thus the elements of happiness for the laborer vanish. Many laborers resented the "Full Dinner Pail" issue in the recent campaign. Intended as a picturesque presentation of the prosperity argument, it was received with bitterness by those who saw in it an insult to themselves; who saw in it, to quote a Chicago Alderman, "the wages of a horse."

---

[2] Report, Vol. I., p. 15.

This is, in outline, the laborer's survey of the fundamental purpose of government and of his actual situation. He is inclined to regard government as a failure. Coming to concrete conditions, his initial suspicion seems to meet overwhelming confirmation. Within the field of actual governmental activity he finds himself and his needs neglected. Wars for humanity, crusades to civilize, diplomacy and intrigue, commerce and conquest busy government, while the vital problems of national industrial life are all but ignored. Messages of Presidents and Governors are scanned in vain to find proof of sympathy with labor and its wrongs. Legislatures seem to be equally indifferent. Laborers approach them to seek protection, not as citizens to representative, but as suppliants. They plead for recognition and while pleading discover, or seem to discover, that representatives of wealth, of corporations, of employers have preceded them and won a sympathetic hearing. When, however, the laborer is heard and possibly a commission is created whose purpose it is to investigate the conditions of labor, its personnel is so made up that laborers lack confidence; when its report is made—if it is made—it seems to result in no great good. Even more, if a law is actually enacted protecting the interests of labor it may easily be rendered ineffective by the employer. The right of laborers to organize is practically nullified when employers will require that workingmen state under oath that they belong to no union, and that they will join no labor union within a given period. Again, the law, *e. g.*, in Pennsylvania requires that wages be paid every two weeks if desired; it also forbids companies to force employés to patronize company stores. Wages are paid every two weeks, if desired, and laborers may buy where they choose. But in the mines those who ask their wages every two weeks or who fail to patronize the company store are blacklisted. Then when some one or many must be laid off, such are chosen; when a part of the mine yields poorly, such are sent there. Laws made in the interests of labor are very often declared by the courts to be unconstitutional because they are "class legislation" or violate freedom of contract. Again, in construing common or statute law the courts seem to favor an interpretation which sacrifices the laborer and his rights to some vague principle of law. Then the laborer believes that the reckless use of injunctions by the courts against workingmen and nearly always directly to the advantage of an employer proves undeniably that the most sacred of our institutions is captured by his enemy. "Workingmen are as helplessly the slaves of the judicial system of the United States as the Italian impoverished workingmen are of the monarchical system of Italy."[3] Furthermore, the laborer finds that executives frequently call out militia to suppress strikes or disturbances, because public order is destroyed and property menaced. He points out that when employers are law breakers no military forces are called into requisition to protect laborers and their rights. Not only that, but employers themselves actually succeed in using the law as an instrument by which to oppress laborers.

Contact with political parties, which are an organic part of our national life, tends to confirm the laborer's pessimism. Democrat denounces Republican and Republican denounces Democrat; epithets, insinuations, open charges of everything from treason to theft are exchanged without hesitation. Votes are purchased; devotion to the "rights of man" is professed by rival candidates unblushingly. As a result the laborer very often suspects the sincerity of all parties and looks for help from them with but little hope. Were he not easily flattered, shortsighted and quickly captured by empty phrases, at times the result might be more serious than it is.

Thus along the entire line of civic hope and action, from the towering phrase, "Life, Liberty, Equality and the Pursuit of Happiness," down to the bi-monthly payment of wages, the laborer believes that he finds government a failure, law ineffective, our political institutions a means of oppression, public officials corrupt, the courts in the hands of his industrial enemy and political parties insincere. Language like the following, therefore, has serious meaning: "Organized capital is arrayed against organized labor. It has taken its stand against fair wages and honest labor. It is arrayed in the unholy conspiracy of lowering the standard of living of families of the laboring masses. It is becoming a synonym for organized injustice, heartless cruelty and soulless aggression. With the help of a servile press, it is a menace to human brotherhood, is an ever increasing evil. It is in complete control of our government. It controls executives, the legislative bodies, the courts and the army. By combination and lawless aggression it is attempting to control industry, destroy competitors, break up labor unions, lower wages and enthrone itself as the monarch of industry, of government, of society."[4] Equally emphatic is the view of the *Ma-*

---

[3] "Locomotive Firemen's Magazine," September, 1900. [4] "Spokane Labor Journal," quoted in "Locomotive Firemen's Magazine," September, 1899.

chinists' Monthly Journal:[5] "The present iniquitous system has put parasites in public office, debauched every Legislature in the land, degraded parties, polluted the ballot and made elections a saturnalia of corruption." The climax in the development of such sentiments is reached when we find that the congress of Colorado railway organizations declared last summer: "We believe that representative government is a failure."

By the side of this increasing hopelessness as regards government the conviction becomes stronger day by day that laborers must depend on law, on government or on an effective substitute for protection and elevation. They have determined on self help. Out of this hopelessness and this determination has sprung the labor union. It is labor's act of despair in government and hope in itself. "Despite all high sounding preambles and resolutions, despite all protests of a mutual desire for equity and justice, despite all the weaknesses that have developed in the economy or the policy of the trades union, in it alone have we been able to discover a means of protection for the toiler against oppression and wrong."[6]

All despair possesses some latent bitterness which is easily provoked and all determination may quickly become fierce; this twofold change has taken place in the attitude of laborers. Those among them who are active, are conscious of high ethical motives; altruism is the spirit, justice the purpose in all that they deliberately attempt. This is seen from the following, taken from a letter by Mr. Gompers, which had not been intended for publication: "Liberty, the conception of which is a matter of growth, a matter of education and is a matter of progress, proceeds in the same ratio that the people conceive their rights and will manfully, heroically and with self-sacrifice stand for it, and which no power in the form of government can stand. It is the purpose of the trade union movement to instill this larger manhood, this greater self reliance, this intelligence, this independence in the hearts and minds of the workers. . . ."[7] Laborers find that the institutions under which they suffer know only egoism as a principle and wealth or power as their purpose. They find commercialism, dishonesty, trickery everywhere. The contrast is, for the laborer, striking; it strengthens his conviction in the justice of his cause. Nevertheless laborers are very generally misunderstood; as a result of the misunderstanding, condemned; as a result of the condemnation, scorned.

Laborers believe that they are habitually misunderstood and misrepresented by the press. The great newspaper is primarily an investment. It is capitalistic, it represents the employing class. Hence the laborer believes that by colored statements, partial truths and falsehood, it constantly harms his cause by misleading the public. The Chicago Federation of Labor once determined to send a committee to Springfield to force through, a law compelling newspapers to publish only the truth. Through the press, misunderstanding is widespread; the purposes, methods, mistakes, actions of laborers are constantly placed in a false light. The laborer sees so clearly and others fail to see. He wishes no strikes and people persist in thinking that he does. He loves order, peace and safety, and the world accuses him of loving anarchy, riot and bloodshed.[8] He struggles for what he regards as justice, and he is accused of seeking luxury. He desires a home, and he is suspected of wishing a palace. An employer who testified before a sub-committee of the present Industrial Commission said: "Make it easy for the workingmen to get a home and strikes will cease. . . . I attended an anarchist meeting on Lake street not long ago, and I found that the longing to have a home was the inspiration of every man at that meeting."[9] The home for which laborers long means nothing more than "good, comfortable clothes, good, comfortable fare, good, comfortable shelter," to quote a member of the committee which investigated conditions in 1884. Whatever be thought of the aspiration, however the world at large takes it, laborers regard such a home as a necessity, the object of legitimate seeking, and they know that society has made it impossible for them to have it. Another form of misunderstanding is found when laborers in general are condemned as approving excesses which they actually repudiate and which are due exclusively to local or accidental conditions. An illustration is found in a statement attributed to a prominent army officer on the occasion of the mine troubles in Idaho: "Since the trouble largely originates in hostile organizations of men known as labor unions, I should suggest a law making the formation of such unions or kindred societies a crime."[10] Recalling the contrast in purpose, motive and spirit as viewed by the laborer, between him and his enemy, we can easily realize that this widespread misunderstanding will not be without its effect. A spirit of resentment is engendered, a tone of vindictiveness is heard; the latent bitterness of the laborer's despair becomes a force; the latent fierceness of his determination to help himself becomes a power. This development may aid us in explaining the habit of exaggeration in statement and excess in action so often witnessed among laborers: the attitude of suspicion toward even those who wish to aid them; the spirit of intolerance, so unlike what one would expect in such a movement: phases of the action of laborers regretted and repressed by none, more eagerly and persistently than by the more thoughtful in their own ranks.

---

[5] July, 1898. [6] "Iron Moulders' Journal," November, 1900. [7] Letter to Mr. Boyce, President of Western Federation of Miners, on the occasion of the mine troubles in Idaho. The letter was published by the U. S. Senate, Document 42, Fifty-sixth Congress, First Session.

---

[8] Emma Goldman, the anarchist, offered her services to the strikers in Chicago last spring. Her interference was resented by the laborers, who would not recognize her. She had expressed supreme contempt for the American workmen before that, as they were impervious to her ideas. "Chicago Chronicle," March 15, 1900; "New York Daily News," November 22, 1899. [9] "Chicago Chronicle," March 23, 1900. [10] "Locomotive Firemen's Magazine," September, 1899.

Coming more closely to the heart of the situation, we find laborer and employer face to face in the determined struggle. The employer epitomizes history and actual institutions in the mind of the laborer. Movements are judged, institutions tested, laws appreciated by their bearing on the employer. The eye of the laborer is fixed; he gazes eagerly, intently upon him and through him the laborer reads his social philosophy. The laborer's view of the employer then is the laborer's view of society, law, government. Now, in dealings between laborer and employer the dominant sense is that of master and servant, dictator and subject; all obligations rest on the laborer, all rights centre in the employer. The power of the individual employer is great. It is increased by understandings with other employers as to wages, men, etc. The best expression of this power—that most hated by laborers—is found in the blacklist. For the employer, thus superior to the laborer, everything is business, curt, matter of fact, calculating business.[11] Business is heartless. Safety appliances on railroads were long resisted because the companies seemed to think less of the lives of their men than of the expense entailed by the change. Guards and covering for dangerous machinery in factories were reluctantly introduced when law compelled it. Incompetent engineers, whose ignorance caused the loss of many lives in iron works formerly, were cheaper than skilled engineers under whom loss of life was extremely rare. Great business men sometimes recognize no ethics in business. A prominent trust magnate stated to the Industrial Commission recently: "I do not care two cents for your ethics. I do not know enough of them to apply them."[12] The kindly consideration of vital human rights in laborers, rights which, in their eyes, give all sacredness to institutions and all sanction to authority, are ignored. Yet watchfulness, care, attention, interest, even enthusiasm are demanded from laborers and they are forced to manifest all. One workingman can quickly ruin a brand of cigars, a cotton or wool worker can materially affect the quality of the product, an engineer or brakeman can cause untold destruction. They all know that they have the power, but they dare not use it. Innocent as well as guilty would be punished and necessity or starvation would be the outcome. Employers have the advantage; laborers are in their power. By the side of that consciousness laborers entertain the conviction that they alone produce wealth; that accumulations of capital are filched from labor; that the employer is a robber who ignores natural justice. The laborer believes that he is the equal of the employer. "We feel that the workman of the present is the equal of his employer in every way other than financially, even though we are forced to admit that the equality is impaired by those in whom we have placed the law-creating and law-applying functions of our government."[13] The result of this phase of the whole situation seems to be that a deep sense of injustice is engendered. The laborer's attitude to government, courts and legislation is of a general character. Here we have a concrete issue, a particular relation. Laborers feel that they are robbed; wealth thus taken is employed to oppress them. Hopelessness made bitter and determination become fierce, welcome a new element—one of tremendous power—the sense of grave injustice.

---

[11] An accurate presentation of this view may be found in the "Railway Trainmen's Journal," July, 1899.
[12] Preliminary Report, Part I., Testimony, p. 118.

In all social movements, even in all human conduct, doubt may be a source of much weakness; but opportune doubt is certainly the proof of much wisdom. Laborers never doubt. Among those actively engaged in the movement there is the deep abiding conviction that they are right. This conviction, like many others in human history, is not so much the product of thinking as the result of feeling. It possesses all the force, persistence and consciousness that any mental state can have. It is a conviction which makes unselfishness easy and heroism a matter of fact, one which converts men into apostles, dull men into orators, mild men into aggressive leaders, aggressive men into fanatics and drives enthusiasts into the ranks of hopeless idealism or anarchy. Like all deep convictions it is a source of light when guarded, a source of blindness when seen alone; a power for good when properly related or modified, a power for destruction when unrestrained. Such is the tyranny of this conviction over the minds of the laborers who share it fully, that they are often blindly obstinate; they lose all sense of adjustment; the faculty of toleration is destroyed, the power to see limitations to their principles or reasons for compromise is largely lost. All great truths must be taught slowly. Teachers must have the sense of situation and be guided by it; they must know the "psychological moment" and use it. Laborers who are most aggressive seem unable to do so. There are apparent contradictions of a vital kind in their gospel; they forget them; there are times when insisting on a fantastic application of a principle excites ridicule; yet they insist. The President of the United States could not lay the corner-stone of the Federal Building in Chicago unless he became a member of the Stone Mason's Union. He actually did so by accepting a membership card. Later there was a threat to expel him because he allowed United States troops to be sent to Idaho to quiet the labor troubles there. The incident awakened widespread dislike and condemnation of labor unions in the West and it contributed in no visible manner to the triumph of union principles.

---

[13] "Railway Trainmen's Journal," April, 1899.

Finally laborers are convinced that they have a high and holy mission to humanity, to save civilization, to bring material redemption to man. They feel and teach a responsibility to society on this account; appeals to the sacred character of the mission are frequently made. Massive pauperism is to be exterminated, wives and children are to be saved, oppressors are to be dethroned, they who labor and sit in darkness and mourn are to receive power. Earnestness is increased by laborers' belief that processes now at work will quickly bring disaster unless checked. The constantly increasing centralization of industry augments daily the employers' opportunity to oppress labor. Improvement in machinery, it is thought, will rapidly displace labor and render workingmen still more helpless. The mission is, then, to reorganize society that it may be protected; man will be the basis of reorganization, brotherhood its law and inspiration, equality its ideal. It is the teaching of trade unions "that the only hope for society and civilization, that the only freedom is through organization, and it should stimulate every worker in the movement to work as he has never worked before to spread organization to every craft and calling until the workers of the world are solidly united. Then will war with all its failures and disasters disappear, and the new civilization, which is the brotherhood of man, take place."[14] Similarly the President of the American Federation of Labor stated before the American Social Science Congress, September 2, 1891: "We are carrying the standard for which men in all ages have suffered exile, imprisonment and death by rack and stake and gibbet." The fight is to be kept up "till the last enemy of industrial freedom is routed and economic emancipation secured to a free and independent people."

It was stated on a preceding page that there are many sources of uncertainty in a study such as this. The exposition of the laborer's point of view attempted here is not, cannot be entirely correct. It is at most an approximation. Each sentiment to which attention has been called actually comes to expression often in labor circles. But what does that expression mean, passing rage or settled hatred, pompous and reckless talk or genuine declarations of deep feeling? It seems safe to say, while waiving that question, that the view outlined is one actually shared by a goodly number; furthermore, it is the view toward which the whole labor movement seems to be consciously and rapidly tending; it is the view by which the meaning and power of the movement can be best understood. In psychological generalizations caution is necessary. All of those elements are not found in every laborer any more than are all the elements of the Catholic or the American spirit found in every Catholic or every American. That phases of this view are found among nearly all laborers is quite certain. Between that great number in whom some of this spirit is found and the smaller number in whom the spirit entire is found there is a series of stages which defies classification. These observations should be kept in mind to hinder us from exaggeration after reading the description here offered. We may now seek to study the modifications of the view and the obstacles to development which it actually meets.

---

[14] A contributor in "American Federationist," August, 1898.

Women and children constitute a large portion of our working population. In the labor movement, however, they are sufferers or spectators rather than actors. They do, in fact, exert a very great influence as the object of solicitude for husbands and fathers who protest because those whom they love suffer. The phlegmatic, the stupid, many of the selfish and prosperous and the inert among laboring men may also be eliminated from our study for the moment. They may share in a way more or less of the view in question, but in them it does not become a vital force. We have narrowed the field to the more thorough, more intelligent, sympathetic and progressive. In them the view is a power; among them the labor union begins to be. Among them, I say, for the labor movement is broader than labor unions. The broader movement can scarcely be outlined, but that is not necessary for the moment. The labor union is the most concrete, most powerful, most positive phase of the movement. On that very account it itself has become a vital issue. In the group of laborers to which attention is now directed we find three divisions. Many—maybe one and one-half million—believe that the union is the only means by which laborers can be saved; others do not believe such to be the case.[15] What they think positively I do not attempt to say. Others are carried to extremes; they work out the logical consequences of the view and become socialists or anarchists. Between these two fractions of the working population labor unions have a difficult position. Since they have been kept in mind throughout this study as fairly if not thoroughly representative, we shall proceed to examine how these new phases affect the situation.

---

[15] Some enter unions through fear of them: some do not enter because of expense, though they believe in unionism.

The unionist is dominated by the "class idea." The individual is merged into the class; he must serve the class, fight for it, because through class action alone will safety come. He must surrender personal liberty, act under corporate class direction, work when and where the union permits. Great as is the sacrifice, the unionist makes it readily and assumes the financial burdens implied. But the non-unionist, the "rat" or the "scab," recoils from this. The class idea does not animate him. To work when permitted and to strike when ordered; to go hungry and to see wife and children in misery when work is abundant—to do this if required is too much. Yet such are expected union demands. Unionist, with class idea, and non-unionist, with the idea of personal independence, clash; as a rule the strike is the occasion of battle. The union striking, hopes to punish the employer by enforced idleness; hence work is suspended. If the non-unionist offers to replace the striker and is accepted, the strike is robbed of efficacy. The unionist sees in his enemy, union philosophy baffled, union methods cheated of result, union sacrifice nullified and union progress checked. The non-unionist sees in the other, arrogant assumption of authority, unjustifiable interference with personal liberty; the right not to organize is as sacred to him as is the right to organize to the unionist. The two parties have taken an attitude of unconcealed hatred; they war with each other even to death. Very often, then, the employer is the *tertius gaudens*.

This hatred must be added as another element in the view which we are studying. From it the movement receives much of its "bad temper." To it may be ascribed most of the riots, bloodshed and destruction of property which have characterized labor troubles.[16] In a strike where non-union men do not appear as antagonists we generally find good order. During the recent strike in Pennsylvania every agitator and organizer urged the strikers to remain at home, avoid drink and even protect the company's property. The strike was one of the most orderly yet determined which we have witnessed in recent years.

As remarked a moment ago, the labor union has to reckon with the socialist. He has simply gone farther in the same line as that traveled by the union. He tries to urge the union forward, while it attempts to restrain him. Feeling here is not at all as intense as in the case of the non-unionist. Many socialists have been, many actually are, members of trades unions. The opposition of the unions to socialism rests on expediency, not at all on principle. The columns of the labor press are open to the socialist. When he attempts to control a labor convention or to secure the adoption of a platform pledged to socialism and political action, then there is a struggle. But the contest is more or less good natured; hence its effect on the temper of the movement is secondary.

---

[16] Recently the non-union men in the Machine Trades in Columbus formed a union against unions. They accept manufacturers, superintendents and others as honorary members. They are pledged against strikes and boycotts. The settlement of wage questions is declared to be "of private individual privilege of adjustment."

Were the point of view described uniformly taken by all the members of trade organizations it would result in a revolution such as we can scarcely imagine. The best friends of organized labor may still be loyal while thankful that many circumstances prevent the view from developing to the depth and with the rapidity which one might expect at first glance. The view is present in all its elements, but the concentration which would make it dangerous and the unity which would make it irresistible are lacking.

Geographically our laborers are widely scattered; the fatal distinction of local interests exists. Our individual States are supreme in nearly all questions affecting labor. The sense of solidarity is materially affected by this condition. Within the State, variety among industries creates diversified interests. As a rule, no time finds all trades suffering. The spirit of discontent does not wax strong when the laborer is prosperous. The federation idea among American unions aims to correct this situation. We have city, state and national unions of trades; city and state federations of unions, and last of all, the national federation, known as the American Federation of Labor. Some powerful unions are not affiliated with the Federation. Yet they recognize that individualism among unions is disastrous. Hence the attempt made in a convention in Toledo last summer to unite the five great railroad organizations more closely, viz.: Engineers, Firemen, Conductors, Trainmen and Switchmen. This division among unions—lack of coöperation rather—is a serious obstacle to the development of the power of the unions as a whole.

Strangely enough, the organized laborers have their own "social classes," their own aristocracy. Men who belong to some branches of industry regard themselves as "above" those who belong to other trades, not held in such good repute. Wives and children share the feeling; possibly they are in a way to be blamed for it. A well-known official of a great railroad organization once said that no four dollar a day man can afford to go on a sympathetic strike for a one dollar a day man. Social differences exist; they are a barrier to class solidarity. While they will not prevent individuals or unions from sharing the laborer's point of view fully, they prevent the fusion of views and the development of one uniform consciousness—of a far-reaching solidarity. In that fusion rests labor's only hope.

Party allegiance is another important factor. A strong Democrat or Republican who is a member of a labor union may not take squarely the laborer's point of view. Instead of losing confidence in government and legislatures, he will to a certain extent blame his political opponents for many of labor's wrongs, and he will look to his own party for redress. Naturally the party press favors such a tendency. So true is it that party ties produce this effect that recently it was urged as an argument of great force against the establishment of a union daily paper. Union men would not support such a daily, it was claimed, since they prefer to read a paper which is the recognized organ of their parties. I do not believe that this has as great influence as one might infer; what the effect is cannot, of course, be very accurately stated.

Again, a great number of valuable men are lost to the labor movement in various ways. The movement is a campaign; it requires leadership; its leaders must be trusted; they must be men of ability, experience and power. Many who show capacity for leadership are promoted in business; they are advanced until they are lost to the labor movement. Tricksters and politicians sometimes work their way to power as leaders and then betray the trust. Sometimes the movement is ungrateful and it forces out, men whose genius might be of greatest service to the cause which the unions represent.

It is difficult for us to realize what the trade union means—difficult to measure the process by which a slight local protest has been transformed into a force affecting our institutions, coloring our social philosophy and actually pointing in the direction in which society must proceed. There can be no question that the labor unions mean this. It were wise then to understand them—wise to grasp the situation. Studying facts with our eyes will never discover to us the secret power of the labor movement. We must see, hear, feel, think as the laborer does. In this study such has been the aim. No plea is made for or against the laborer—for or against the employer. The plea is that we understand views as well as facts. Were that more generally kept in mind, less writing would be necessary and more would be done to alleviate conditions which we all regret.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Washington, D. C.

CATHOLIC FEATURES IN THE OFFICIAL REPORT ON EDUCATION.

INTENSE interest was manifested recently in regard to the tiny planet named Eros, because of its utility in the determination of some astronomical problems at a certain phase. In the geometric appearances on the surface of Mars not a few men of eminence betray a concern almost feverish at certain periods in the planet's rotation. The apparent eccentricities of Algol, the demon star, as it is called, continue to furnish mental exercitation for very many estimable men of science. Other celestial facts claim the attention of learned individuals and bodies in these States, by day as well as by night, and shorten the hours that ought to be devoted to sleep. But, from all that we have been enabled to see or hear, or connote in any way whatsoever, not one in a thousand of those erudite and philosophic persons gives the smallest consideration to phenomena much more relative to human concerns, and infinitely more valuable to the true philosopher. We refer to the phenomena of the world of education, as revealed in the annual Reports of the Commissioner for that department of the United States Government.

More than once it has been our pleasant duty to call attention to the manifold merits of these periodical statements, yet it is a singular fact that their annual appearance is productive of little or no comment in the public press. So far as we have been enabled to observe, no publication of note beside our own has ever taken the trouble to analyze any of the very important *résumés* presented by the Commissioner and his contributors, and but very scant notice of the Reports has been taken by the daily press. The briefest statement of the number of pupils attending the different grades of schools, and the percentage of scholars to population, as a rule suffices to satisfy the curiosity of the public, so far as that sentiment finds reflection in the leading papers. Such a result is not just. It would appear to indicate an apathy about the question of education in general on the part of the population of the United States such as by no means exists, or else an indifference to the work of the Commissioner most ungenerous and unjust.

It is a serious evil that such apathy should prevail over so important a subject as this, and some effort ought to be made to ascertain why it is so and some corrective applied. Possibly a reason might be looked for in the bulky character of the annual Reports. These are usually presented in two volumes, each containing about twelve hundred pages. Most of this is in small type, taking about seven hundred words to a page; so that the reader who would like to learn all he could on the subject would be face to face with the task of wading through nearly a million seven hundred thousand words, besides tabulated statistics in bewildering profusion. Possibly more attention would be secured by the issuance of quarterly reports, or separate statements as they are sent in, accompanied by some hint as to their relative importance as factors in the determination of special theories or experiments in the ever-engrossing problem of mind-development and the making of the perfect entity.

It is only of recent years that Catholics could find anything save of negative interest in these voluminous returns. The uninstructed stranger, glancing through them, a decade or so ago, would never have found in them any reason to suspect that there were millions of Catholics in the country maintaining a separate system of schools, and colleges, and universities of their own, without a cent's help from the public funds. Since the present Commissioner had his attention drawn to such a remarkable hiatus in statistics, it is but just to acknowledge he has endeavored to prove himself more useful to the historian, in the matter of presenting a true picture of the country's progress in the field of knowledge than he had been doing and his predecessors had done. The Report for the year 1898-99, which is now to hand, is full of matter of the highest interest to the Catholic reader.

One needs, however, to do much more than take the index headings if he would find some of the most valuable portions of history bearing on Catholicism and religious education in these little-read annuals. There are by-paths and trails to be found in the most unlikely-seeming places. For instance, as we open the volume now before us in the way most convenient for reading purposes, which is by making halves of its bulk, we find confronting us a good lengthy biographical sketch of one of the country's earlier educators, Samuel Knox, written by Dr. Steiner, of the Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, an authority on the educational development of Maryland and Connecticut. This Samuel Knox was a Presbyterian clergyman from the North of Ireland, who settled for a considerable time in the capital of Maryland and carried on academies or colleges there and in other places in the course of a somewhat checkered career. This man, full of Ulster bigotry in his heart, yet with fair-seeming principles on his lips and dropping from his pen, appears to have exercised considerable influence in the formation of public opinion on the subject of education in the State wherein Catholics had first laid down the broad principles of an enlightened toleration. By voice and pen he appears to have been incessantly ventilating his theories on a national system of instruction from the alpha to the omega. Splendid liberality shines in some of his pronouncements. Thus in one particular publication we find him appealing to men of all religions, from Catholics to Covenanters, to beware of "interference with the religion of any man considered as a candidate for office," while in several others he is seen furiously attacking the Rev. William Du Bourg and the Sulpician Fathers who had just opened St. Mary's University at Baltimore, simply because this was carrying out an earlier suggestion of his own to the effect that all denominations provide schools of theology and religious training generally for its own teaching body. The catechism prepared by Abbé Fleury for the use of Catholic schools was in especial condemned by Knox's partisans in the violent logomachy which his attacks stirred up, as well as the "Jesuitical spirit" of the Sulpician Fathers. Able pens on the Catholic side refuted the calumnies of Knox and his supporters, and the pamphlets and letters in the public press which were elicited by the attack made a literature of very respectable dimensions. The controversy was the means of stirring up a very bitter feeling in the State, and thus effecting what Knox, at the beginning of his career therein, was so plausibly earnest in deprecating; viz., the inclusion of religious considerations amongst the qualifications for public office.

Knox's theory of national education, as formulated, did not exclude religious teaching. He would have the knowledge of God inculcated in some vague creedless way, and have a course of prayers of the non-committal order form part of the school exercise, together with the reading of some invertebrate homilies on religion, likewise morals and ethics. His programme, under this heading, as we read it now, suggests the notion that his spirit sits at the editor's desk in some of the offices wherein pabulum for the non-Catholic religious world is now produced by the week or by the month, and finds relief in the incessant aspiration after a Christianity with Christ as an abstraction and an unrestricted field for all comers as to what it is necessary to believe for the attainment of salvation. There can be little doubt that, apart from Knox's peculiar notions on matters of pedagogical detail, his views on the function of religion in education were widely held in the beginning of the several State systems, and found expression in some shape or other until they were proved to be unworkable and, so, abandoned for the present plan of total exclusion of religion from the school, the college and the university as established by the State.

The personality of this early educator bears an important relation to the genesis of the subject, as we may consider him as a type of at least one of the groups which exercised a preponderating influence on the early stages of the evolution. He is thus described by one of his pupils, Mr. John P. Kennedy: "He was a large, coarse, austere man, with an offensive despotism in his character, which not only repelled all love, but begat universal fear and dislike among the boys. He was not much of a scholar, either, I should say, and was far from successful as a teacher. He had no pleasantries by the way, no explanations, no appeals to one's own perceptions of an author's merits."

Many other side-lights on this absorbing question will be discovered by the reader who has the leisure and the patience to wade through the different able papers bearing on the general subject included in the Report. But our limits will not permit us to do more than indicate that the search will not be fruitless. We may leave the quest here, and pass on to note something more positive in the way of proof that the Catholic aspect of the subject is no longer overlooked in the survey now annually made by the liberal-minded Commissioner, Dr. Harris.

Chief amongst such positive proofs is the inclusion in the Report of the full text of three addresses of Bishop Spalding's, on themes related to education recently. The third of these discourses is distinctively a plea for religion in education. It is entitled "The University: a Nursery of the Higher Life;" and it is introduced by an observation of Montaigne's: "In my time and country learning cures the disease of the purse fairly well; that of the soul not at all. To him who has not the science of virtue all other knowledge is harmful." As the only true science of virtue is religion, Montaigne's sententiousness in this regard assumes a peculiar significance, in view of the fact that his own philosophical tendencies at times seemed to leave him floundering in matters of belief, much as the "higher criticism" and the extravagant claims of the scientists on the subject of creation do a good many thinkers of our own particular era. It is not possible to overestimate the liberality which prompted the inclusion of these remarkable addresses, having regard to their pronounced character as pleas for Catholicism in the training of the American citizen. The most careless reader could not fail to be struck with the force of their reasoning and the singular grace and boldness of their style. They are pleas couched in the spirit of modern American notions, hortative of the search for knowledge in every visible field of inquiry and the development of every latent and active faculty of the mind for the attainment of the highest things possible to the grasp of human thought. But they are pleas for religion, above all things—for the interweaving of the spiritual with the intellectual process, in the delicate task of building up the mind's fabric in youth; and so, in a large measure out of sympathy with, if not in actual hostility to, the principles of the system whose progress it is the Education Commissioner's official duty to register and record and, in a negative way, to philosophize upon, or at all events to prepare the materials whereof for the philosopher.

"Do we not extol the Church," queries the learned prelate, in a treatise on "The University," "for what, in ages that are gone, it accomplished in behalf of literature, art and science? Do we not hold that modern civilization is largely due to the influence of the Catholic religion?"

Now, such are not the propositions upon which the structure of public education in this country has been reared; rather the very contrary has been sedulously instilled into the minds of the people at large. Wherever it has not been sought to prove that the Church is the inveterate enemy of education, it is at least inculcated that if she did set up the university and the school, she did it with the selfish and narrow purpose of strengthening her own influence or reining in the intellect within a fixed pale of pedagogy. This vicious tendency is well exemplified in the introduction to a history of the secondary school system in the Kingdom of Hungary which forms a portion of the same volume which blazons Bishop Spalding's eulogy of the Church as a teacher. A few sentences culled from the document reveal the animus of the chronicler:

"During the earliest epoch the Church ruled supreme in educational matters in Hungary as well as in other countries. Wherever the Church stepped upon the scene the clergy, with the well understood purpose of strengthening its own position, established schools as an irresistible means for the assertion of its power. The Latin language and ecclesiastical teachers predominated, and the object of the schools consisted exclusively in preparing clergymen and believers. This tendency received a new impetus through the Reformation. The competition arising between the different denominations called into existence a new school at every step, which school was to act as a fortress of the faith. . . . Scholars who had returned from the West brought with them an eagerness to reform and remodel, much to the disadvantage of home traditions. Thus the national individuality suffered."

Here we behold cropping up the views of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists. It would be utterly unreasonable to expect the Commissioner of Education to use his blue pencil in such cases; if he did so in the one case, he certainly could not be blamed for also doing it in the other. The further he delves into the sources of education, no matter where almost, the more he finds how closely the beginnings of it had been intertwined with the history of the Church. Here is an influence that cannot be excluded; when he finds it unjustly assailed, what can he do, in common fairness, but admit the pleas in defense which he finds publicly confronting him?

The ideas which permeate society in this great country to-day are found reflected in the tone of the greater number of the collective reports which make up this one official report. These ideals are chiefly secularism in education; education whose aim is summed up in the one word, "practical." If religion be not hated—and we thankfully say that such is by no means the case—it is considered, at all events, inadmissible in the curriculum, because sects are many and the brains to devise a system to meet the just requirements of all are scarce. From previous reports of the Commissioner it is permissible to infer that he himself shares the view of the secularists that a liberal education is in itself sufficient to make a man or woman all he or she needs to be—perfect in mind and body, morally and intellectually great. This being so, we cannot but confess the magnamity which permits a scholar like Bishop Spalding to emphasize the opposite view in many memorable passages like this one:

"The universities of the past, as those of our own day, have but partially fulfilled their mission because they have failed to foster a deeper and purer moral life. Nay, often they have been and still are the nurseries of vice. The radical failure is moral failure, and the education which does not promote conduct, which does not build character, bears within itself a mortal taint. . . . When philosophy is studied as an intellectual pastime and conduct is looked upon as a matter of policy, no genuine education can be given or received.

"Religious faith and conduct are the basis of right human life, and the student who is not inspired by this principle may become a brilliant or a famous, but not a great or a noble man. . . . 'What rendered the University of Paris powerful, nay, positively formidable,' says Savigny, 'was its poverty. It did not possess so much as a building of its own, but was commonly obliged to hold its meetings in the cloisters of friendly monastic orders. Its existence thus assumed a purely spiritual character and was rendered permanently independent of the temporal order.'"

What Scotland owes to the Church and to this idea of the function of education is placed clearly enough before the readers of this interesting and impartial Report, in the course of an exceedingly fair and graphic sketch of "The Mediæval Universities of Scotland," by Professor Ritchie, of St. Andrew's. Before the foundation of any of the Universities north of the Tweed, observes Mr. Ritchie, a number of enlightened Scotch ecclesiastics formed a society for the instruction of all who chose to attend their lectures. At their head was the Abbot of Scone, Peter of Lindores, who expounded philosophy as taught by Peter Lombard, the great authority of the Middle Ages; others expounded theology; others again canonical and civil law. Then the Scottish universities grew up, as did those of Paris and Bologna, by a sort of voluntary process on the part of successive enthusiasts in the cause of education—Churchmen all—and in due time came the Popes' bulls authorizing the formal establishment of St. Andrew's, Glasgow, and Aberdeen."

It is at this point that we would like to invite the reader's attention to the momentous bearing on civilization, in its broadest meaning, which the process called the Reformation had on the work of the university everywhere. We have seen how the Hungarian chronicler deprecated the influence for evil, from his point of view, which the foreign university had on the Hungarian student. It affected his national sentiment. It made him broad-minded. The mediæval European university was cosmopolitan. Students of all the "nations" residing at these centres fraternized in the noble brotherhood of learning and philosophy. Every best civilizing influence was there exerted to promote the brotherhood of man and the extinction of ancient feuds. The "Reformation" came to undo all this beneficent work. It scattered the "nations" and hunted the teachers with the "dogs of war" for many woful years. The influence of the Church on this great process of consolidating the different States is thus graphically outlined by Professor Ritchie:

"In the Papal bull for the foundation of St. Andrew's a term is used as convertible with universitas studii, which originally had a distinct meaning—studium generale. This term contains more of the meaning we usually connect with a university, but it is likewise often misunderstood. It does not mean an institution for the study of all sorts of subjects, but an institution for students from all quarters of the world, as distinct from a merely local school. It was this cosmopolitan character of the mediæval universities which brought the Pope into special connection with them. It came to be recognized that only the Pope, or the Holy Roman Emperor (in those countries which acknowledged his authority) could confer the necessary privileges; and thus even studia, which had arisen and acquired a more than local reputation independently of Papal and imperial authority, came to apply for Papal bulls and imperial charters. It is this, also, which explains the way in which the universities of one country came to influence the type of those in another, irrespective of neighborhood or of political ties—how, *e. g.*, the universities of Scotland bear more resemblance to those of Italy and of Germany and of the Low Countries than to those of England, or even of Scotland's ancient political ally, France."

Here it should be observed that although the universities were potent in inducing the broad spirit of cosmopolitanism among the students, and so coöperating with the systematic Papal policy of peace among all the European States, it was not obnoxious to the principle of nationality. It will be remembered that Mr. Andrew Lang, in his recent work on "John Knox and His Times," bore unqualified testimony to the sturdy nationalism of the Scottish bishops in all the disputes with England, previous to the disastrous "Reformation" days. When the Hungarian commentator sets down that deterioration in the national character was a result of the habit of sending students to the foreign university, if we accept the statement as reliable, we are driven, by a comparison of the two cases, to the conclusion that the national spirit in the average Hungarian was not a plant of as lusty a growth as its congener that grew in "Caledonia stern and wild." Before the blighting influence of Knox and the English conspirators who plotted the extinction of Scotland's faith and nationality was felt over the land, the Catholic nobles, though turbulent, were patriotic; thenceforward they mostly "sat on the fence" or took sides with the Saxon.

Men of thought, true scholars and educators, deplore all things which make for the hostility of nations and individuals. It is the men of evil mind who cry out for war and arrogance of man toward weaker man. Professor Ritchie sees nothing but loss to civilization in the destruction of the old character of the university. He winds up his interesting paper with this sobering retrospect and reflection:

"The immediate effect of the ecclesiastical revolutions of the sixteenth century was to destroy, to a great extent, the international character of the universities and to make them merely national institutions. Scotland was, indeed, in some respects less cut off from the Continent than England. Scottish students, after the Reformation, resorted to Leyden and Utrecht, as in older days they went to Paris or Bologna. In this century we are recovering a little of the international academic sentiment between students of different countries; and it is a most valuable sentiment, which may make more for peace and civilization than much of the work of statesmen and ambassadors."

It is not often that we meet with such frank testimony from a Protestant authority to the beneficent influence of the Papacy and the system of Catholic teaching of which it was the universal patron. Such an admission as this compensates for whole volumes of stupid misrepresentation of the aims and objects of Catholicism such as those upon which the Protestant population of this country have habitually been nurtured. Vain and impotent must prove the efforts of writers like the Rev. James M. King to poison the wells of history while there be magnanimous souls like Mr. Andrew Lang and this Glasgow professor to come forward as the champions of truth.

In the annual Report preceding the one now under review there appeared a series of papers of an exceedingly valuable character on Education in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, by R. L. Packard. They were distinguished by impartial historical statement, exhaustive statistical analysis, and a manifest desire to lay the truth before the world no matter to whom it might be disagreeable or disappointing. In this new volume we find another set of reports on the same subject, but by a different writer. We often meet the name, F. F. Hilder, in the Commissioner's collations, and chiefly in connection with countries of Spanish settlement; and we have noted that he is invarably out of sympathy with the subject, so far as the religion of the people is concerned, and has little good to say for the clergy or the efforts made by them to educate the people. In the particular paper now under notice this tendency is particularly marked. He begins by blaming the religious orders in the Philippines for not beginning the educational process by starting primary schools instead of colleges. In face of facts well known to every reader, such an objection looks exceedingly puerile. It would be exceedingly hard for any one to put his finger on any country in the world where education did not begin from the top, which was the only way, indeed, in which it could begin, and perfectly in accordance with the natural law. It is true, says F. F. Hilder, that"schools were established throughout the islands, but little progress was made in them, as the teachers did not understand Spanish, and what little rudiments of education the children acquired were forgotten when they left the schools." The result of the system is, he adds, that a large proportion of the Filipinos are "woefully uneducated." This conclusion seems to be one of those dangerous things known as half-truths. The whole world knows now that a large proportion of the Filipinos are either savages quite or semi-savages; that a considerable number are Mahommedans, slave-dealers, and polygamists, and so, perhaps, wholly irreclaimable. Their condition is not due to any fault of the religious orders, but is chiefly owing to the inaccessibility of their *habitat*, physical obstacles and climatic conditions. It is downright dishonesty to hold either the Spanish Government or the religious orders in any degree responsible for the social conditions of such people. The glaring character of the suppression is still more evident when we recall the fact that Spanish missionaries went repeatedly among these wild tribes, and often paid the penalty of their beneficent efforts for their reclamation with their lives.

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that while Mr. Packard, in preparing his report, strove to do justice to the religious orders both as educators and social uplifters, his successor was desirous of ignoring their claims and holding them responsible for conditions over which they had no control. Mr. Packard shows the Spanish clergy not only as Christianizers and schoolmasters, but as stout defenders of the people's civil rights. He traces the efforts of the Spanish officials and commercial speculators to exploit the natives for gain, in the same way as the same class did in the South American settlements among the Indians, and he shows how the clergy, animated by the spirit of Las Casas, put their backs against the wall and said the iniquity should not be. What the Spanish rulers called the "Encomienda" was introduced into the Philippines in the year 1581. It was a species of slavery—forced labor, in lieu of which the laborer got food, some little pay and some pen to sleep in. Practically it amounted to serfdom. To the Filipinos, who had had, long before the Spaniards arrived, a tribal constitution, with *fueros* of their own, the Encomienda system was maddening. But their antagonism to it would have been futile, probably, were it not backed up by the stern remonstrances of the clergy throughout the settlements. These were not content with protesting to the Crown officials in the archipelago, but took care that their remonstrance should reach the ears of the King. The strong step had an immediate effect. His Majesty issued a decree putting an end to the Encomienda system and decrying all other forms of extortion practised by the officials. These wrongs had been so flagrant that the clergy begged the King to be allowed to return to Spain if they were not stopped, inasmuch as they could not stand by and see them perpetrated by the heartless tribe let loose upon the people by the colonial government.

Now, with regard to the "woefully uneducated" condition of the islanders, as charged by F. F. Hilder, Mr. Packard quotes an abundance of eminent authorities to the contrary. He cites M. Alfred Marche's "Six Years of Travel in the Philipppines" (Paris, 1887), who found five alphabets in use among the islanders and schools, under the control of the priests, "in every village." The love of the people for music M. Marche found to be remarkable. In every village there is Mass, he says, and music at every Mass. The music of the bands in Manila he judged to be as good as what he heard in Madrid. Nearly all the Tagalos, he declares, can read and write. Instruction among the Indians, he observes, is far from being backward when compared with the position of the lower classes in Europe. The monks at St. Tómas had published a Tagalo grammar and dictionary, and a combined grammar of the Tagale, Bicol, Visaya and Isinay languages. Semper, another experienced explorer, but one evidently hostile to the Church, is also quoted by R. L. Packard. "Every village," he says, "has its public school, in which instruction is obligatory," but he objects that besides reading and writing, only Christian doctrine and Church music are taught in these primary schools. Jagor, another authority quoted, adds that the teachers were obliged to impart a knowledge of Spanish, although, paradoxically enough, he adds that they did not know it themselves. In introducing further testimony to the same effect by the great authority, Blumentritt, R. L. Packard shows his spirit of justice by remarking that while other men go forth in search of adventure inspired by purely selfish motives, the Catholic priests went all over the world, encountering death everywhere, from the woods of Canada to the remotest parts of China, impelled only by the spirit of "self-sacrifice and devotion for what they believed to be the spiritual welfare of savages and heathen."

How different this from the faint praise or scrupulous suppression by F. F. Hilder!

It would, finally, seem as though the Commissioner himself were conscious of the shortcomings of the latter's statement, inasmuch as in the Introduction he embodies a statement of Senor Agoncillo's regarding the educational and intellectual status of the Filipinos, which more than bears out the favorable estimate of European observers. Two schools, he states, are to be found in every large town; and if the population exceed five thousand, the number of schools is correspondingly increased. Their scope, he says, is much the same as that of the American schools. They teach, besides, something more than reading and writing; Christian doctrine, the Catechism and church music. Geography, grammar, the Spanish language, arithmetic and history are likewise taught the pupils; and the teachers are mostly native priests who have passed the course in the normal college.

As if in order to remove all possibility of misconception as to his own attitude, the Commissioner also calls upon Blumentritt for a conclusive judgment. "The Filipinos have a greater proportion of educated people among them than the Kingdom of Servia or the Principalities of Bulgaria and Montenegro. There are fewer illiterates among them than in the States of the Balkan Peninsula, in Russia, in many provinces of Spain and Portugal, and the Latin Republics of South America. The Filipinos pay more attention to schools than Spain or the Balkan States."

Weighing all the facts presented in ths voluminous Report, the Catholic philosopher must find much that is consoling and hopeful in the phenomena which it reflects. On the one side he finds the hand of enlightened impartiality sweeping away the cobwebs of prejudice regarding the aim of the Papacy in the glorious work of intellectual uplifting; on the other the steady persistence of the clergy in the same cause, after the work had been rudely interrupted in Europe by the revolt of heresy, in face of death and danger in the trackless wilds of the new-found world. If the pen of prejudice and jealousy would fain belittle the results of those splendid sacrifices, the spirit of fair play at the fountain-head arises to rebuke the injustice and let the impartial world judge for itself on whose brows should rest the palm of merit.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

THE SECOND PLENARY SYNOD OF MAYNOOTH.

IN the Pastoral addressed to the faithful of the Church in Ireland by the Fathers of the Plenary Synod of Thurles we find these words: "Our enactments we shall immediately submit with the profoundest reverence and submission to the judgment of the Apostolic See; and we will not publish them until we shall have obtained the necessary approbation." The Fathers of the First Synod of Maynooth say in their Pastoral: "In accordance with canonical usage, the results of our deliberations shall not be made public until they shall have received the approbation of the Roman Pontiff." The acts of the Synod recently held at Maynooth have already been sent on to the Holy See, but of course they will be a secret until they have been confirmed in Rome and can be published in their final legislative form. So strictly bound to secrecy are those who are officially present at a Synod that even a Bishop who might be present by right but is absent through necessity cannot be informed of what passes in Synod. Such a case actually occurred at the First Provincial Synod of Westminster.[1] The Bishops of Liverpool and Nottingham were unable to be present. At the opening session Provost Crooke, who was Procurator for the Bishop of Liverpool, asked if, in case he wanted to know the views of his Bishop on points discussed in the course of the Synod, he might communicate with him, and it was decided that he could not do so.

However, whilst officials must be silent, the officious will talk, and various conjectures are abroad. Some say that the recent Synod of Maynooth has made little or no changes on the decrees of the first Synod held there in 1875. Some say that there has been legislation with regard to the Christian Brothers; and on the strength of similar conjectures no persons in Ireland have been more exercised over the proceedings of the recent Synod than the Presentation Nuns and the Sisters of Mercy. Because officious persons, who always know more than officials, are quite certain that the Sisters of Mercy will have a Mother General, and that the Presentation Nuns will be taken from their present partial enclosure and will realize the original purpose of Nano Nagle. A very wise rule in the procedure of Synods is the decree *De Secreto Servando;* for the officious who of course should have been official if Canon Law were wise, would be sure to sit in judgment on the deliberations of the Bishops, and would make improved recommendations which would stand as a norma by which to test the wisdom of the Holy See.

---

[1] See the Acts of the Synod, page 16.

Whatever be the final result of the recent Synod, its acts and decrees will be an index of the present needs and the general position of the Irish Church; for, being the outcome of the corporate jurisdiction of the Bishops, they must be made to meet the needs, not of a diocese or a province, but of all Ireland. In this connection it may be well to observe that the legislative power of a Plenary Synod is not the combined authority of the Bishops. It is something quite distinct, and for which a new element is necessary. If the Bishops of a country assemble and legislate on the strength of their united jurisdiction merely their legislation would resolve itself into so many diocesan decisions which would not have the canonical value even of a Diocesan Synod. Each Bishop, of course, brings his own jurisdiction with him into a Plenary Synod; else he would have no right to be there; but he also shares in the corporate jurisdiction which the Synod has, and in virtue of which alone it legislates. The new element which gives form to that jurisdiction comes from the Holy See. Formerly when Primates and Patriarchs had jurisdiction over Archbishops they could summon the Bishops of a nation into Plenary Synod and confirm its acts. But that jurisdiction is a thing of the past. In those times also the power of Princes was often in requisition. They were invited, and they thought it a privilege to lend the aid of the secular arm in sustaining the authority of Bishops and their Synodal decrees against erastian laics or schismatical churchmen. But the habit of intervening led them in the course of time to forget that theirs was an auxiliary part and a position of privilege; and when it suited their ambition they easily mistook fact for right, and though earthly kings, arrogated authority in a kingdom that is not of this world.

Metropolitans have not jurisdiction over one another, and therefore when the Primatial and Patriarchal jurisdiction in this matter ceased, the direct action of the Pope became necessary to convene ınd confirm a National or Plenary Synod. But the Pope commis- ˈons one of the metropolitans to do so, who is therefore called an Apostolic Delegate, and holds jurisdiction as such for the purpose of the Synod only. The aid of kings is no longer available, and their pretended right to interfere is repudiated. Even the term "national" as applied to Plenary Synods has fallen into disfavor and almost into disuse, because of the color it might lend to those royal pretensions. Erastianism is but a pagan principle—*cujus est regio illius est religio*—revived by Christian Princes to gratify their greed of domination.

Thus it was as Delegate of the Holy See that Archbishop Kenrick presided over the first Plenary Synod of the United States held at Baltimore in 1852, that Archbishop Spalding presided over the second at Baltimore in 1866, and that Cardinal Gibbons presided over the third in 1884. By virtue of similar delegation Cardinal Moran presided over the two Plenary Synods of Australia at Sydney in 1885 and 1895. It was as Apostolic Delegate that Cardinal Cullen presided over the Plenary Synod at Thurles in 1850 and at Maynooth in 1875, and that Cardinal Logue presided over the Plenary Synod recently held at Maynooth. Whilst those Synods of the United States, Australia and Ireland are Plenary Synods, the Synods of Westminster presided over by Cardinal Wiseman in 1852, 1855 and 1859, and by Cardinal Manning in 1873, are but Provincial Synods, although all the Bishops of England were present at them. Cardinals Wiseman and Manning did not preside over them as Apostolic Delegates; there was no need of such delegation, and there was none. There is but one metropolitan in England, and he has the power as metropolitan to summon his suffragans, but the Synods summoned and presided over by him by virtue of his own jurisdiction could be and were only provincial.

The Archbishop of Dublin is Primate of Ireland; the Archbishop of Armagh is Primate of all Ireland. The latter takes precedence of the former and each takes precedence of the Archbishops of Cashel and Tuam; but in each case it is only a precedence of honor.

In the Pastorals issued by the Irish Bishops at the close of the Synod of Thurles they "announce the happy termination and gratifying results of the most solemn and important assembly that has been held by the Irish Church since the days of our glorious apostle, St. Patrick," and that "it will become an epoch in the history of our national church; an epoch which will not only be found pregnant with immediate benefits, but which will throw its directing light and influence on the future." The Fathers of the first Synod of Maynooth open their Pastoral with those words and add: "Twenty-five years have elapsed since these words were uttered; and although a quarter of a century is but a brief moment in the life of the Church of God, *in whose sight a thousand years are as yesterday*, yet it has been long enough to furnish proof that these hopes have been abundantly fulfilled." The Pastoral just issued by the recent Synod opens thus: "As we contemplate the actual condition of the Church in Ireland, and its progress since the first Synod of Maynooth twenty-five years ago, we see on all sides manifest reasons for thanking God always for the grace that is given to you. For, whether we regard the Church's external organization or her living spirit—the outward forms in which her manifold activities show themselves, or the unfailing power of God's grace which as a living fountain wells up amongst her children unto eternal life—our hearts are filled with joy."

Those words allude to two elements in the Irish Church—the material manifestation of the people's faith and the living spirit within. "At other times and in other places there have been richer and grander churches than ours; but it has often happened that as the material building arose in strength and beauty, the spiritual edifice was crumbling into ruins. Thank God it has not been so in Ireland."

They have reason to thank God and to be proud of a people of whom they are able to say: "It is this spirit of faith that marks the singular harmony which exists in Ireland between the Church's growth in outward form and grandeur and her progress in the sanctity of her children." "The cowl does not make the monk" is applicable to a people as to a person. With many nations it would seem as if, when they had expended money and energy unsparingly in raising sanctuaries to God or in benevolent institutions where His charity is enshrined, they forgot the purpose for which they worked, gloried in their own goodness and finally slided from the spiritual life which had put forth its activity in such beautiful forms till little more of the Church of God remained but the shell, and of His worship "in spirit and in truth" only the shadow. It is quite otherwise in Ireland. The thatched chapel has disappeared and splendid buildings have been raised to replace them out of the poverty of the people, assisted largely by the generosity of their kinsfolk who have sought and found fortune in America. These temples stand out in their stateliness and architectural beauty as so many enduring symbols of the living faith of the people, quickened by trial into greater life and activity. "To those who observe us from the outside," as the Pastoral says, "these works seem but ill-proportioned to our poverty. And so they are." But the eye of faith that has designed them takes a wider and higher view of their purpose than that which mere political economy gives and which is umscribed by the narrow limits of the present life. But even n the economist's point of view they have been the occasion of ributing much money over the country. They have also stimud Irish art, although not so much, I think, as might be. The hitecture is, of course, entirely Irish; and so are the carving, nting and sculpture to a large extent. But these, too, should be or as nearly all as possible, the work of Irish artists. I am now isidering it æsthetically rather than economically. I look onward a time when those who are to come after us might study the genius and development of Irish art in the churches which we are building to-day. They cannot come to venerate if we do not build the shrines. The saints and the scenes from the Gospel are, of course, substantially the same whether represented by home or foreign art. But art is not as mere photography; it is colored according to the genius and the ideals of a people. In this sense it is that I should like to see transferred to canvas or wall or marble the sanctity of the imitators of Christ as assimilated by the ideals of Irish faith. Better work may come from abroad, and in exceptional cases it would be insular narrowness to set it aside. But in general our churches should be the homes and the shrines of a sacred art which we could call our own. The art of every people had to pass through a process of development. Every best begins at its worst; and if we wait till we are at our best we shall keep waiting forever. Cimabue and Giotto came before Fra Angelico, and if these had been disregarded for Greek models Italy to-day would present the absurdity of a naturalistic Christian art as represented by Titian and Benvenuto Cellini instead of the noble productions of the pre-Raphaelite painters; and the influence of those two schools of artists have been as divergent and far reaching as have been the literature created by Dante and Petrarch on the one hand and by Boccaccio on the other.

I have been speaking of the material manifestation of faith in Ireland. But the piety of the faithful of all classes and of both sexes has notably increased for the past fifty years. In the early part of the century men as a rule went but once or twice a year to the sacraments. That was not owing, in the vast majority of cases, to any want of faith. It was largely due to the customs in which they had been brought up. The Irish priests of those times were for the most part educated in France, and they brought home that spirit of rigorism which prevailed there. Moreover, the people were just coming out from under the cloud which had hung over them during the penal times. For generations they had to think less of how often they could go to the sacraments than whether they could venture to go at all. The people still point out in secluded glens all over the country where Mass was offered up by stealth on rude stone altars with the heavens for a canopy. In a pamphlet published in 1884 Dr. Nulty, the late Bishop of Meath, says: "In my own boyhood I frequently heard old men glorying in the ingenuity of the stratagem by which they were smuggled as merchandize in wagons covered with tarpaulins to the hiding place of the Bishop who confirmed them. They were conveyed back again as 'goods unsold' without exciting the suspicion of the authorities."

The following will illustrate how it fared with Catholics in Ireland even so late as the early years of the present century. An old priest who died a few years ago told me of a Protestant landlord in the County Limerick who used to send an order to the parish priest of the neighboring town in the harvest time to have the chapel cleared out and ready for the magnate's men to thrash his corn in it. The command was yielded to for a long time. But a new parish priest came, who was made of sterner stuff.[2] When the usual message was brought to him he sent back the following reply to the local despot: "Go back and tell your insolent master that if he dares to meddle with or desecrate my chapel I'll send him home with a sorer and a wiser head." The despot and his men came with the corn, but they did not thrash it. That process was in preparation for themselves. The priest was there to meet them at the head of a body of stalwart parishioners, and the desecrating despots prudently desisted. It must be said to the credit of the landlord that he duly appreciated the courage of the priest, and became his faithful friend for many years. In those times the Irish priest had in many cases no fixed residence, but depended on the hospitality of the people. To that state of things is to be traced the privilege which is peculiar to Ireland—that priests are still allowed to say Mass in the houses of their parishioners. Even the old custom of holding "stations" still remains in some parts of the country. That singular privilege of having Mass in private houses has been withdrawn in some dioceses. The Holy See would have prohibited it altogether, but owing to representations made by the Bishops that the faithful, born into the custom, would think it a great privation, it is tolerated. At present, I believe, permission has to be periodically renewed; and it is not improbable that the recent Synod has proposed to restrict the privilege still more. The custom is, of course, an unspeakable benefit, but it has its drawbacks also. Several other customs peculiar to Ireland have grown out of abnormal conditions brought about by the Penal laws. They grew out of the necessity of the times, and they lingered on after the necessity had passed away. Hence when we find defective baptismal and marriage registers, the absence of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament in most country churches, and other liturgical shortcomings, it would not be fair to put them down to want of zeal on the part of the clergy or to want of piety on the part of the laity. The Rosary was the only form of public devotion which the people could always perform, and they have clung to it with a devout fidelity which is not to be found elsewhere in Christendom. In some country places the people assemble in the chapel before Mass on Sundays where some pious and intelligent man of the parish "gives out" the Rosary, and the others join in. There is hardly a Catholic family in Ireland in which the Rosary is not recited every night during Lent and Advent, and in most of them throughout the entire year. The Association of the Holy Family, introduced a few years ago by the Holy Father, has made a great revival of the Rosary devotion in Ireland.

---

[2] That priest died as late as 1844.

Before the churches and their emoluments were confiscated a priest was present at the churchyard to perform the burial service at the grave. Then the churches and the churchyard passed under the control of the parson, and Catholic burial service was prohibited. The people solved the difficulty by taking some of the earth from the grave, often at a great distance, to have it blessed by the priest; they then take and scatter it on the grave before the coffin is lowered down into it; so that in spite of the law and without the ministrations of the parson the body of the deceased would be laid to rest in consecrated clay. That custom is kept up to the present day.

One can readily understand how priests who were brought up in such circumstances were glad to be let live at all, and did not always encourage sodalities and popular devotions such as we are used to at present. We now think them indispensable elements of spiritual life; if we had lived in Ireland in the days and circumstances of our fathers we might think otherwise. It must not be thought, however, that sodalities were unknown in Ireland till lately. I have in my possession some books of devotion specially compiled for the use of Sodalities of the Blessed Sacrament and other confraternities, printed in Dublin, Cork, Waterford or Limerick, in the early years of the century. I have heard of a poor old woman who died a few years ago at a great age, and who could sing the Latin hymns and recite the Latin psalms of Vespers from memory. She had learnt them in her early days in Limerick. But it is only within the present generation that popular devotions have spread to any great extent. There are few parishes in country or town where Sacred Heart Sodalities are not established. Even now the outside world is not aware of the extent to which they have grown. A great many practices of piety go on, and a good deal of spiritual activity is abroad all over the country which outsiders or passing visitors would never suspect. Even converts to the Church are much more numerous than is generally known; not so numerous as elsewhere, because Protestantism in Ireland is a symbol of ascendancy; it means social privilege more than religious conviction, whilst Catholicism carries with it in their minds the tradition of inferiority and exclusion from the good things of this world. These spiritual activities are not so much advertised in Ireland as elsewhere; and let us hope that the Catholics of Ireland will always think it enough that God knows what they do in His honor without calling the attention of the world to look and admire them. Monthly confession and communion is a common practice with both sexes and amongst all classes; and those who neglect to do the Easter duty are very few. Intemperance, which was once so prevalent amongst all classes—in fact, was a tradition of extravagant respectability borrowed from the old gentry—has greatly decreased in the country parts and is less than it used to be in the cities. Working on holidays of obligation has become very common in late years; at the time of the first Synod of Maynooth it was very rare. We have been drawn into the ways and vices of the commercial world without sharing much of the benefits. We have let ourselves pass unconsciously through a process of Anglicization which many of us little dream of. The English "Reformers" thought that industry was retarded by the number of Catholic holidays; so Protestantism did away with them. In recent years they have come to think that the people had not holidays enough. They did not, however, revive the old holidays which they had done away with—that would be too much of an honor to Catholic saints—but they created new ones and called them "Bank holidays"—I suppose in honor of the God Mammon. Unfortunately the Catholics of Ireland have yielded, and have followed these changes in the humor of English Protestantism in this as in other things. It is to be hoped that the Gaelic revival will succeed in restoring these things, together with the mines of beautiful Catholic thought hidden away in the language which our Catholic fathers spoke.

The work which confronted the Bishops who assembled at the Plenary Synod of Thurles in 1850 was in some respects far more difficult than that which lay before the Bishops who assembled at Oscott and Baltimore in 1852. "In it for the first time," says the Pastoral of the first Synod of Maynooth, "the Irish Church, at the issue of her three centuries of martyrdom, was enabled calmly to survey her own condition, to mark the wounds of which in the heat of the struggle she had hardly been conscious, and to replace in fair order, according to the Sacred Canons, the scattered stones of her sanctuaries. It was one of the first fruits of the blood of her countless Irish martyrs, who had sown in tears that we might reap in joy. It was held amid the prayers of an entire nation, chastened by heroic endurance of recent suffering. Its will was the unanimous voice of the entire body of the Irish Bishops, speaking with authority inherited through long lives of venerable predecessors, from the sainted founders of the ancient Episcopal Sees of the land. It was convoked in face of a great danger threatening the faith of the country, and in obedience to a special mandate from the Apostolic See in whose loving guidance all afflicted churches are sure to find 'defense and security, a haven where no waves swell, and a treasure of blessings innumerable.' The work of such a Synod was not meant in the designs of God to be transient, nor was its influence to perish as soon as its immediate objects were attained; but rather its spirit was long to survive, to be to the Irish Church an abiding source of vitality and strength in which, from time to time, her youth may be renewed as of an eagle."

For many years missions and retreats are given periodically in all the parishes of the country. The devotion of the *Quarant'ore* exists in the cities. Religious examinations are held annually in the schools of many of the dioceses. In all the cities and large towns the laity have branches of the St. Vincent de Paul Society for the relief of the poor. "Wakes," which were meant as a token of reverence for the dead and had become an abuse, are ceasing to be what they unfortunately too often were; and in some places they are gradually disappearing, as the custom is being introduced by the clergy of having the corpse taken to the church where that is practicable. The custom is also coming in of having marriages celebrated before Mass, at which the bride and bridegroom receive Holy Communion. I may here mention a remarkable illustration of the devotional tendency of the people which occurred within the past few months. A regiment of the Limerick county militia have been encamped in England during the South African war. They asked the local priest to direct a confraternity which they wished to form in the camp. He gladly consented, and every week several hundred of them assembled for devotions during their stay. That is a strong evidence, coming spontaneously from a body of men from whom such inspiration might be little expected.

A dozen pages or more of the Synodal Pastoral is taken up with the question of education in Ireland—primary, intermediate, university and technical. The Synod of Thurles and the first Synod of Maynooth were occupied with the same question, and we may, for a certainty, expect to find definite declarations of the Bishops on it amongst the decrees of the recent Synod. It looks like the final battleground on which anti-Catholicism seeks to try the faith of the

Irish people. "We are no longer assailed by open persecution and cruel edicts," wrote Cardinal Cullen in 1856,[3] "but we have amongst us wolves in sheeps' clothing, lying in wait for the tender lambs of the fold. Confiscation of property, exile, the rack, the sword, so often employed against our fathers, are no longer spoken of. Education, charity, the Bible are now inscribed upon the banners of those whose bigotry and fanaticism in past days delighted in persecution and blood."

During the reign of Henry VIII. about 1,000 educational institutions were destroyed in Ireland. Out of confiscated Catholic property and public money were founded: The Parish School Act in 1537, Diocesan Free Schools in 1570, Trinity College in 1591, Royal Free Schools in 1605, Erasmus Smith Schools in 1669, The Blue Coat Schools in 1672—with the purpose of making the Irish, Protestant in faith and English in sympathy. By the 7th of William and Mary all Papists were prohibited from teaching school under heavy penalties; and the child who went abroad for education as well as the parent who sent him forfeited all their belongings. Henceforth arose the "hedge-schools,"

> "Where the teacher and the pupil sat
> Feloniously to learn."

Yet by 1730 the Protestant Primate Boulter wrote: "I can assure you the Papists are here so numerous that it highly concerns us, in point of interest, as well as out of concern for the salvation of these poor creatures, who are our fellow-subjects, to try all possible means to bring them and theirs over to the knowledge of the true religion; and one of the most likely methods we can think of is, if possible, instructing and converting the young generation; for, instead of converting those that are adult, we are daily losing many of our meaner people, who go off to Popery." He suggested a new system known as "The Charter Schools," which began their work in 1734. In 1775 a by-law was made by which only "Popish children" were eligible for admission into them. In 1787 Howard, the philanthropist, caused a public inquiry to be made into their condition, which revealed lying reports on the part of those who controlled them and filth, neglect, immorality and ignorance on the part of the children who were to be enlightened out of the superstitions of Popery. After ninety-three years of existence they were finally swept away. But during that time they cost £1,600,000 sterling—all spent on not more than 12,000 children, and for such an "education" as Howard had exposed. In 1758 Catholics were allowed to open schools, and according to Mr. Wyse[4] the Catholic priests by their own exertions and without any public money educated each year four times as many as were "educated" by the Charter Schools at such enormous cost during the whole of their existence. He mentions that one priest in County Sligo established no less than thirteen schools, and adds that similar instances occurred elsewhere through the country.

---

[3] "Writings of Cardinal Cullen," Vol. I., page 418. [4] "History of the Catholic Association," Vol. II., page 92.

The same anti-Catholic purpose established the Hibernian Military School in 1769, the Hibernian School in 1775, the Female Orphan School in 1790, the Association Against Vice in 1792, the London Hibernian Society in 1806, Kildare Street Schools in 1811, Institution for the Deaf and Dumb in 1819. Cardinal Cullen[5] gives a list of several other institutions founded with a view to the enlightenment of the Papists. But he points out that charity begins at home, and that the money thus wasted might be usefully spent in England. He quotes from a report signed by twenty Anglican Bishops: "The almost incredible degradation in morals as well as religion in which the masses of our people are sunk;" and from a Mr. Kay, of the University of Cambridge: "I speak it with sorrow and shame that our peasantry are more ignorant, more demoralized than those of any in Europe."

In 1831 the Government tried to mend their hand by the introduction of the "National School" system, of which Archbishop Whately, whilst openly declaring it an innocent system, privately expressed his confidence that it would "soon wean the Irish people from the errors of Popery." That system has been cobbled many times since it was established; each stage of improvement betraying the fact that the original purpose of the system is still inspiring and hampering the action of those who are responsible for it. In 1847 they established "model schools," to be examples of pedagogy for the ordinary National Schools. By the year 1867 these, about thirty in all, had cost £50,000, and they have been costing about £30,000 ever since. Though meant mainly for the supposed benefit of Catholics, hardly any Catholics go to them. I find, moreover, from Inspectors' returns that they are behind many of the National Schools in efficiency. The Royal Commission of 1869 condemned them as an utter failure; and the late Lord Randolph Churchill said that "they are the greatest imposture that could be kept up in Ireland."

The whole system on which educational opportunities have been offered to the Catholics of Ireland has been from the beginning a system of defiance and denial as long as that was possible, then of hypocrisy, deceit and cobbling. The history of the action of the English Government in this matter is such that they seem to have lost the faculty of framing an educational system for Irish Catholics without slipping in some crank by which to twist the work of the machinery into proselytism. Little wonder that the Irish Bishops suspect whatever they offer, however denominational in appearance.

---

[5] loc. cit.

In the matter of higher education the Synod will probably have little to say that has not been said already in 1850 and 1875. For, in this, the Government has done little or nothing. They have an intermediate system by which Catholic youth are prepared for and encouraged to aspire to a university training, whilst they deny a university where the Catholic youth may go for it with safety to their faith.

The Pastoral also alludes to the establishment of a *Catholic Truth Society* for the dissemination of good literature amongst the people. It began its work last June, and in the five months which have since elapsed about fifty pamphlets have been issued and about half a million have been sold. It is an open secret that the Bishops have resolved also to establish a high-class weekly Catholic newspaper as an organ of Irish Catholic principles and interests.

Whilst the primary care of the Bishops is, of course, the spiritual and moral condition of their flocks, they have not forgotten in their Pastoral the temporal concerns of the country. It is a peculiarity of Irish ecclesiastical life that the temporal interests of the people enter largely into the cares of the priesthood. Irish history has decreed it so. The people were helpless in the past. They have been persecuted by open enemies, betrayed by pretending friends, and even many of their fellow-Catholics, once they had secured power and social position for themselves, troubled themselves little about their needs. The priest has been the only person to whom they could turn without suspicion. His disinterestedness has been tried by time, and therefore they expect his aid and sympathy in every trial.

M. O'RIORDAN.

Limerick, Ireland.

LEGAL TENURE OF THE ROMAN CATACOMBS.

THE mystery and system of concealment associated with the popular idea of the Roman Catacombs make it difficult at first to understand by what right or by what toleration Christians, before the conversion of Constantine, could have appropriated to themselves extensive tracts of land in the immediate neighborhood of Rome, conspicuously situated along the great highways that radiated from the imperial city. Twenty-six greater cemeteries are enumerated: three on the Appian Way, two on the Ardeatine, one on the Ostian, one on the Portuensis, three on the Aurelian, one on the Flaminian, seven on the Old and New Salarian, one on the Nomentan, two on the Tiburtine, two on the Labicana and three on the Via Latina; besides nine minor cemeteries, all existing during the centuries of persecution; without taking into account six others constructed in the time of peace. How could the Christians possibly conceal their possession of this property, which they held for purposes of daily and public use? By no precautions could it be concealed that the bodies of thousands received burial in these tombs, and that relatives and friends accompanied them to their resting place, and periodically visited their graves. But concealment was not a universal fact, nor a necessary condition of secure tenure: to make this clear is the object of the present paper. The Roman laws which regulated the matter of interment amply protected, unless during times of popular excitement or exceptional legislation, the burial places of all citizens, without distinction of race or religion.

In order to understand the bearing of those laws on the tenure of property by Christians, it is necessary to define what legally constituted a sepulchre in the Roman code, and what conditions had to be satisfied to secure the inviolability of property once devoted to funeral rites. For this definition it may be useful first to describe the usual arrangements of a Roman tomb, and the connected buildings distributed over the piece of land belonging to it. We cannot do better than examine the ground plan of a noble sepulchral monument which has been preserved to us, and is now in the museum of Urbino. It is cut on a marble slab, and pagan as it is, was found in the catacomb of St. Helen on the Via Labicana, where it seems to have been utilized by the Christians to close the front of a loculus. Besides the exact survey made by the State of all the property of its citizens, Roman proprietors were accustomed to have the general outline and measurements of their land carved on stone and erected near the entrance. This was particularly the case with sepulchral ground; and along the Appian Way, and elsewhere near the remains of ancient tombs, stones are frequently found indicating the dimensions of the property: so many feet *in fronte*, of frontage, so many in depth, *in agro*. The Urbino marble is, however, much more descriptive; and although the proportions are not observed in the design, all the measurements are given in exact figures. The monument which it represents stood on the public road, probably the Labicana. The area surrounding the mausoleum is bounded on the right and at the back by a private road, 524 feet long in one direction, to a point where it turns and proceeds for 546 feet more, enclosing an area of ten jugera, or Roman acres. This private road joins a public one which borders a continuation of the property for other 1,783 feet. The marble is broken, and the rest of the dimensions can only be guessed. At the lowest calculation the area between the extreme point of the 1783 feet boundary and the point of the plan where the marble is broken was at least two acres, giving twelve Roman acres as the minimum extent of this domain, consisting of two distinct parts.[1]

The first, in which the mausoleum stands, is again divided into two parts: one, the *area* proper of the tomb on the public road, and the *area adjecta*, contiguous to the monument, immediately behind it. In the centre of the first was the tomb. We cannot say what was its form. It may have been a single chamber, a *cella memoriae*, dedicated to the memory of the deceased, containing his statue or his bust, and arranged with every convenience for the reception of his friends when they came to commemorate him according to custom. It may have been constructed, like so many tombs on the Via Latina, in two stories: the lower, the hypogeum, to contain the urn or sarcophagus, lighted by a lamp; and the other, above, a chamber for the assembly of those who came to recall the memory of the departed. It may have been covered with tiles, or a roof formed with a flat terrace and trellis, *pergula*, where the guests sat in the open air. Of its decoration, its statues, its portico we can say nothing.

The enclosure round the principal building contained at its two extremities dependences which served to lodge the custodian, the gardeners and workmen who looked after the place, a pantry, a cellar, a kitchen, a well and other outhouses. In these dependences alone was it lawful for any one to live. It was sacrilege to make one's dwelling in the tomb itself, in the triclinium, above or against the tomb; and this crime or *piaculum*, was punished by hard labor or banishment. After the burning of Rome by Nero it is recorded that the populace took shelter in the tombs; and fugitives from justice sometimes made them their refuge: but this was exceptional, for it was severely forbidden by the laws to defile by the presence of the living the dwelling place of the Manes.

At the left side of the monument the plan shows a smaller rectangle, also divided into two portions, one facing the public road, the other immediately behind; giving us in smaller proportion the distribution of the larger property. The *area monumenti* in front and the *area adjecta*, or *agellus conclusus* behind. This is an example of those allotments of ground that were frequently made ex *indulgentia*, out of the benevolence of the great proprietor, either by cession or sale to poorer citizens for family sepulchral areas.

To return to the main plan. The first area, the court of honor or forum of the sepulchre, as Cicero calls it (De Leg. ii., 24), was walled about, and on three sides enclosed by a portico. Behind this was the *area adjecta*, called also *hortus, hortulus, pomarium*, planted with trees and flowers, and intersected by avenues. In the rear of this a private road separated the principal portion of the domain from the remainder of the *area adjecta*, the adjoining land, which *cedit monumento*, goes with the monument. This is an instance of the jealousy with which the right of way was guarded by the Romans, when interference with it prevented free access to their places of burial. Cicero reproaches a freedman of Sylla because after usurping land of Roscius Amerinus he would not allow him to pass freely to visit his father's tomb, which was on the confiscated property. In later times a Rescript of Antoninus Pius imposed on proprietors whose land bordered the area of a sepulchre a servitude of right of way in favor of the owners of the tomb, fixing an indemnity in return.

---

[1] For a reproduction of this plan and a detached description see De Rossi, Roma Sotter. I., Appendix at the end of the volume, pp. 55 sqq.

Beyond the private road the land *cedens monumento* spreads to a considerable distance, and is devoted to ordinary cultivation, while the inner *area adjecta* is reserved for ornamental trees, orchard produce and flower gardens: and the immediate court of the sepulchre was left uncultivated as the law prescribed.

In the plan, one side of the most distant area is separated from the public road by a strip of land, portioned off into rectangular divisions of unequal size, indicated by a number of *cippi*, or land marks. This furnishes us with another example of allotments made to poorer citizens for burial places, out of the land of the larger proprietors, and is perhaps the most remarkable demonstration of the custom, which made it easy for the Christians to profit by the dispositions of the Roman law to acquire ground for the excavation of their cemeteries.

Now that we have seen with the help of the Urbino marble the material arrangement of a Roman place of burial, we are enabled to understand something of the uses to which the various buildings were put, and of the system of administration under which the whole was kept, as these are described in another ancient document. This is a copy of a Roman will in which the testator gives directions for the construction of his tomb, and provides for its preservation and for the ritual and family commemorations to be observed after his death. This will was discovered on a parchment in the Library of Basle, in 1863, and is a copy of what had been inscribed in marble on a Roman tomb at Langres in Gaul. The transcript is not entire, but the fragment is of the greatest importance, throwing light, as it does, on the funeral usages of the Romans and on the facility with which the Christians, under cover of the prevailing customs, could substitute for the profane observances of the heathen their own rites, without attracting attention, and remain in undisturbed possession of their cemeteries.[2]

The name of the testator is lost. However, it is apparent that he was a Gallo-Roman, an inhabitant of Langres; and to judge from his equipages, his furniture and garments which were to be burned with him, must have lived sumptuously. His dispositions show us what a rich Roman of the second or third century meant by a tomb. The fragment begins with instructions to his heirs to finish the monument which he had commenced for himself. He directs the *cella memoriae* to be completed according to the designs he has left. This *cella* is to have an exedra, or semi-circular chamber, with two seated statues of the deceased, one of marble, the other of bronze; a couch and two marble chairs and is to be provided with carpets to be spread on the seats, with covers and cushions, and a supply of banqueting garments for the guests on the days when the *cella* was to be open for their feasts. In front of the *cella* and exedra an *ara* was to be erected to contain his bones. A gate of marble, opening and shutting, was to close the entrance. The land surrounding this edifice is to be laid out as an orchard, *pomarium*. Three gardeners, *topiarii*, are to be retained at a salary which he fixes at sixty measures of corn, besides thirty measures for their clothing. He orders the names of the magistrates who were in office when the mausoleum was begun to be inscribed on the outside, as well as his own age at the time of his death. Then follow penalties on his heirs if they suffer any bodies to be burned, interred or otherwise introduced into the ground set apart for his tomb, excepting the bodies of such persons as he himself may have designated. The land is declared inalienable, and the possession of the heirs is limited to its custody, its maintenance and repair. Finally he ordains that all freedmen and freedwomen enfranchised by him are to make every year a contribution to defray the cost of the funeral feast on his anniversary, and to choose each year curators to collect the *stipes*, and to offer the customary sacrifices on the *ara* of the tomb, on the first days of April, May, June, July, August, September and October.[3]

Burial places like the two described in the Urbino marble, and the Basle will, could be quite legally held by Christians, either in their individual names or as a corporation. This is the next step in the consideration of the matter before us. No law prevented them from holding property, although in common with other citizens they were debarred from devoting to burial purposes land within the city walls. But outside the walls, in the suburbs, and in the country, they were at liberty to set apart a portion of land for the burial place of themselves, their families and their friends or others admitted to share the privilege. Like all subjects of the Empire, they were free to bury their dead outside the city, in their villas, their fields or their gardens. Land once allotted to this purpose came to be held under the usual legal conditions of every place of interment.

---

[2] De Rossi, "Bullettino," Aprile, 1864. [3] Id. Dicembre, 1863, where the text of the Will is given.

Roman law divided property in land into *locus purus*, simple proprietorship, and *locus sacer, sanctus, religiosus*, sacred, holy, religious, three degrees or shades of dedication which separated property so distinguished from ordinary property not set apart for any religious or semi-religious use. Only the first division, *locus purus*, simple or ordinary unfettered property could be bought and sold, and be transferred from hand to hand. The three classes of the second division could not be commercially treated, nor diverted from the purpose to which they had been dedicated. They were regarded as *divini juris*, of divine right, and what is of divine right is the particular property of no one.[4] A sacred place, *locus sacer*, was a place consecrated by certain religious ceremonies to the worship of the superior divinities: a holy place, *locus sanctus*, a place protected against invasion and encroachment by peculiar sanction of the law: a religious place, *locus religiosus*, one given over to the Manes or inferior gods. Any place where a dead body was deposited became a *locus religiosus* on certain conditions depending some on the laws of the Pontiffs and guarded by them, some on the ordinary civil law. By the pontifical law a tomb became a religious place only when there was *justa sepultura*—that is, when the body was formally consigned to the earth, *inhumatum*. When towards the end of the republic cremation became general the law was evaded. The ritual of interment and the new practice were reconciled by mingling some earth with the ashes placed in the urn, or burying in the earth a fragment of bone which had escaped the fire. The condition required by the civil law was one only: that the ground to which the body was committed was the free property of the person ordering the interment: consequently a grave did not become a religious place, if it was dug in a field belonging to another, or let to another, or subject to some servitude which the legal consequences of a regular interment would frustrate.

This condition of the law was entirely in favor of the Christians. They abhorred cremation, interment was the only funeral rite they practiced. It is true that they rejected the worship of the Manes, as they rejected all idolatry. But the law did not require the formal dedication of the grave to the Dii Manes, and was perfectly indifferent to the creed professed by the deceased or his friends: the sole fact of the interment, with the prescribed conditions, gave the religious character to the tomb.

---

[4] De Rossi, Roma Sotter. I., p. 101.

In one particular, however, Christians were at a disadvantage, although this was more apparent than real. The religious character attached itself simply to the tomb itself, the rest of the land, gardens, parks, dependent buildings did not share the privilege. A field entirely occupied by graves might be regarded as wholly religious and inalienable; but a field containing a single tomb was liable to be sold, with the exception of the limited area of the grave itself. The pagan had a means of extending the protection of the privilege to the whole of the land; he could invite the Pontiffs to consecrate it to one of the superior gods, Diana, Cybele, Venus, Fortune, for example, making it a *locus sacer;* or to the inferior gods, making it *locus religiosus.* This involved the use of idolatrous rites, and the Faithful were debarred from it. But it does not appear that the pagans themselves had frequent recourse to this method of securing the inviolablity of their burial domains. The reason may have been that the ceremonies were complicated and probably expensive, and because there was a much simpler and equally efficacious way of arriving at the same end. And this was quite as much in the power of the Christians as of the pagans. It was sufficient to insert in the deed of gift, or in the will of the founder, a clause restraining from alienating any of the land annexed to the tomb, under penalty of a fine to be paid to the Treasury, or the Pontiffs, or the College of Vestals.

The Roman legislation therefore protected the inviolable character of land once devoted to purposes of burial, without distinction of religion; did it also secure to Christians immunity from what they would have regarded a sacrilegious profanation, the intrusion of bodies of aliens into their burial places? We know how firm they were on this point. A certain Martialis, who had buried his children among pagans, was for that alone considered an apostate from the Church. The law was here again in their favor, and furnished them with legal means of preventing it. Two kinds of sepulchres were recognized by the law: one which passed from the founder to his heir, becoming the property of the heir after the death of the founder, inalienable as a religious place, but transmissible to other heir; the other was the family sepulchre, which did not become the property of the heir, nor could he dispose of it in any fashion. "Hoc monumentum hæredem ne sequatur" is an inscription frequently met with. In such a sepulchre the founder had a place by right, with the members of his family, and others who, by enfranchisement, bore the family name. The heir, too, might be buried in the family tomb, but had no right to place in it any of his own family or pass it on to others. The founder, or testator, had even the power to exclude whom he pleased in the classes ordinarily admitted to share the family tomb. In this way Christians were enabled to protect their cemeteries from promiscuous burials, and we have evidence in several epitaphs that they availed themselves of their legal faculty to allow the use of their tombs to others, provided they were brethren in the faith.[5]

With a knowledge of the material and legal conditions which regulated the burial places of the Romans, it is easy to understand how the common law completely protected the tombs of Christians, in the ordinary cases of a private *cella memoriæ,* and its dependences, erected by a proprietor in his own grounds. In the example of a wealthy Roman's funeral domain, exhibited in the Urbino plan, we have not only the vast area of the principal owner, but smaller areas of various extent, all devoted to places of burial. The extent of similar enclosures varied to any size, from squares of twelve or sixteen feet to vast tenements and real parks, according to the wealth and inclination of the proprietor, necessarily limited, along the fashionable highways, where land was valuable and quickly bought up.

A Christian had the same right as another citizen to inter his dead in land of his own: the land became at once religious: he could share his tomb with whom he pleased, and exclude whom he pleased. He could provide for its custody, for the decorous observance of anniversaries and for the assemblies of friends or relations in the *cella memoriæ* or the triclinium: he could dispose of funds to defray all the expenses of its maintenance in proper order and fix, if he thought well, a yearly contribution from all admitted to its benefits. In reality this is the first origin of the Christian catacombs of Rome. The earliest denomination given to a catacomb is the name of its founder, a rich noble, or a pious matron; and the same names have come down to us as the original owners of the land where the catacomb was excavated. Thus we have the prædia, or farms, of Lucina, of Flavia Domitilla, of the Cæcilii, of Prætextatus, of Pudens, of Cyriaca, the Ostrianum; the little field, agellum, the property of St. Agnes where she herself was laid; the *hortus,* gardens of Justus and Theon, all in Rome; and out of Rome, the *areæ* of Macrobius, of Evelpius, etc., in Africa.

A classic example of this origin of a historic catacomb is offered in the primitive portion of what is called the Catacomb of Callixtus—the Cemetery of Lucina on the Appian Way. An area with a frontage of a hundred feet and a depth back from the road of two hundred and thirty feet, encloses what still remains of a massive quadrangular tomb now stripped of every inscription and ornament. It has been made out with almost absolute certainty that this tomb belonged to the family of a lady, whose Christian agnomen has alone been preserved, but who was a descendant of the Cæcilii or of the Cornelii Æmilii—perhaps that celebrated Pomponia Græcina whose conversion to the Christian faith, and trial by her husband are described by Tacitus.[6] The prædium, like the subject of the Urbino marble, was divided into two parts, the area proper, or court of the tomb, occupying the full frontage and extending back from the public way fifty feet, leaving a hundred and eighty feet of area adjecta reaching to the extreme boundary of the plot. In this second portion, more remote from the road, and behind the principal monument, Lucina, or one of her descendants, constructed a hypogeum, or crypt, for her Christian relatives and her brethren in the faith, with an ample staircase and ornamental doorway leading to the subterranean. The field over this crypt was planted, perhaps, as we see it to-day. At a later period another Lucina, probably a descendant of the first, during the persecution of Gallus, interred the Martyr Pope Cornelius almost at the foundations of the ancient family monument. This cemetery of Lucina is the most remarkable type of a private burial place in its transition from its strictly family character to its incorporation in the public property of the Church. Nearly all the Roman catacombs began in the same way. Around the tomb of the patron, "ex indulgentia patroni," as the pagan inscriptions say, graves were opened for the less wealthy members of the community, just as encircling the tomb of the rich heathen, his slaves, his freedmen and his clients found a resting place.

---

[5] Id., p. 109.

The Christians adhered to the system of private tenure of their property in individual names as long as they could. It was safe and suited their purpose as long as the cemetery remained within moderate limits, and its cost of management did not overtax the resources of the owner. When the graves were few the proprietor and his army of servants were sufficient for the work of the cemetery; but although the system of construction permitted level under level to be excavated, the enormous numbers that had to be buried soon exceeded the resources of the place, and th owner retired from the responsibility, which was assumed by the society for whose benefit the cemetery had been hitherto administered. So the growth of the Christian population, and the force of circumstances led to the introduction of another system, that of corporate tenure, and management under the immediate control of the ecclesiastical authorities.

It may seem extravagant to speak of corporate tenure and of possessions of the Church as an established and recognized body in the reigns of Decius, and Valerian, and Diocletian; but there is no doubt left on the point, and the evidence is both abundant and conclusive.

---

[6] "Dublin Review," April.

Promiscuous burial was hateful to pagan as well as Christian. No Roman would be buried among strangers, he must be buried among relations, friends, or persons associated to him by some common bond. Hence arose numerous burial societies or clubs, composed of members of a common trade, natives of the same province, inhabitants of the same city district. They had each a schola, or meeting place for celebrations and repasts, they bore the expense of a funeral and a tomb for their members. They took various titles, as Worshipers of Jupiter, of Hercules, of Diana, of Silvanus; sometimes a mysterious name, as "Companions who feast together;" or took a name from their founder, as the Syncratians, the Pelagians, etc. Funeral clubs were lawful in Rome from the first century by a decree of the Senate. A special permission was required in the provinces. Towards the end of the second century this restriction was removed, and a rescript of Alexander Severus sanctioned their erection under certain conditions. Up till that time Augustus' system of diffidence directed the imperial policy, but circumstances favored a change. The old aristocracy, decayed or decimated, was replaced by a new nobility without prestige or traditions; the ties between patron and client were relaxed or broken. The lower classes were beginning to rely on themselves and unite for common interests.

There were poor guilds and wealthy ones. Indeed the law at first was in favor of the poor, who were allowed to club freely together to provide a decent funeral, but they were forbidden to hold general meetings more than once a month. These less wealthy guilds purchased a columbarium with money given by a benefactor, or collected by subscription among the associates. Other clubs received gifts and bequests of land or money, on condition of rendering funeral honors to the donor and making the customary sacrifices on the anniversary of his birth and of his death, and the offerings of violets, roses and grapes, according to the season.

It was under the semblance of benevolent associations for mutual help, and with the legal protection enjoyed by burial clubs, that the Christians first began to hold in a collective name their cemeterial property. It is in the third century that we have for the first time mention of cemeteries belonging to them as a body; and it was heard in the angry cry of the pagan mobs in Africa: "Areæ Christianorum non sint," Down with the cemeteries of the Christians. The Church in Rome could not have been behind the Church in the province, and accordingly it is about the same time that the earliest document registering the corporate possession of the catacombs appears. It was just the period when the Church first stood out as a regularly organized institution, and was brought prominently into public notice by its activity and influence on society. Now it was not only the conscience of individuals that revealed itself in particular facts, but the society itself manifesting its vitality in organized and corporate action. The first communities had no need to possess land, their richer co-religionists supplied what was required; but with growth and expansion it became necessary to secure by other means the decent burial of their dead. It was also the period when funeral clubs had reached their greatest development throughout the Empire. The unknown author of the Philosophumena, a work of the third century, tells us that Pope Zephyrinus, as soon as he succeeded Victor in the Papal chair, gave to the Archdeacon Callixtus charge of The cemetery. The cemetery antonomastically named was the one now known by the name of the Archdeacon. In that office he had already charge of the Church's treasury. Why was this particular cemetery on the Appian Way selected to be the special charge of the chief official in Rome under the Pope? The cemetery up to this time held in greatest veneration was the one excavated under the Vatican Hill; there the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul had attracted round them all the Popes previous to Zephyrinus. The extension of the circus of Nero had disturbed their repose and occasioned their translation to the third mile on the Appian Way, where the basilica of St. Sebastian stands, a place called *ad catacumbas*. Why was Callixtus not set over the cemetery which contained this precious deposit, but over the cemetery a mile nearer Rome? The reason was because this was the first great official cemetery legally constituted as a possession of the Roman Church, to be administered by its official, the Archdeacon. Doubtless the protection and favor of the noble families who granted the land, contributed to the preference. Whatever may have been the motive of the choice, the fact is established that the cemetery of Calixtus was in the third century the property of the Christians as a corporation.

The appointment of Callixtus to this important office was made with great discrimination. He had been a man of the world, a business man, we should say, accustomed to the responsibilities of extensive management, young with all his experience, active and energetic. Admitted to orders, he gained the full confidence of the Pope and was charged with the immediate direction of the clergy. The cemetery confided to him was composed of crypts constructed by the Cæcilii in their land, and made over to the Church. In his management of it he left us evidence of extraordinary activity, opening new galleries, constructing cubicula and directing their decoration with true artistic taste combined with exquisite religious sentiment. From that time the cemetery of Callixtus was the ordinary burial place of the Popes till peace was given to the Church by Constantine.

Callixtus was at the same time manager of all the temporal affairs of the Roman Church; the support of the clergy, the maintenance of the places of assembly, the assistance of the poor, the administration of the common fund, all centred in him as the recognized representative of the Body Corporate in the face of the public authorities and institutions of the State. We do not mean to say by this that at the end of the second century, or in the third, the Church was recognized as a corporate body with a religious character. What is meant is that association among Christians was permitted; that they, like the rest of the citizens, were free to form civil *collegia,* and did actually unite in such associations, whose legal status was acknowledged, while their religious character escaped notice, or was dissembled under the appearance of Benefit Societies.

We have seen how the poorer guilds were authorized to collect a monthly contribution from the members; and we find the counterpart of this among the Christians. Tertullian informs us that the Christians had an arca, or coffer, "into which the faithful once a month, or when they could and as they could, put their mite for the support of the indigent and their burial when dead."[7] We also know that, besides the distribution of money, gifts in kind were given away by the profane corporations in their reunions, where after the repast in common a sum of money, or a *sportula,* small basket of provisions, was given to each of the guests in proportion to their condition and need. Precisely the same usage was observed in the assemblies of the Christians, where, besides the poor, the clergy and others who were deserving received money or a *sportula,* according to their rank and condition. It was therefore a simple matter for the Church to take advantage of the legislation on funeral guilds to have itself incorporated under their form. The presence of many wealthy members in the community was no obstacle to the formation of the society, because in all guilds the *tenuiores,* more indigent members, were always glad to affiliate as honorary members or as benefactors persons of distinguished rank and position, so that in the guilds as in the city itself there was always to be distinguished the *plebs* from the *patroni.*

Is it possible now to say what was the legal designation of the corporate association of Christians? There is a certain amount of material to lead to a conclusion, but sufficient proof to answer the question in the affirmative is wanting. The material is derived from a series of inscriptions. First of all there is one discovered in Africa, at Cæsarea in Mauritania, which records that a certain Evelpius, *Cultor Verbi*, a worshiper of the Word, gave an area for a place of burial, and built a chapel, *cella*, at his own expense, leaving this memorial to Holy Church. The slab was restored some time later, and the following inscription added: "Ecclesia Fratrum hunc restituit titulum." The Church of the Brethren restored this monument. The singular phrase, *cultor Verbi*, is parallel to what is met with in the designations of the pagan guilds: Cultores Jovis, Herculis, Dianæ, Silvanæ, etc. But "the Brethren" is repeatedly found in inscriptions of the same period. One monument was erected to the memory of "all who lie in this place of rest, by me, Victor the priest, who prepared it for all the brethren." Another was found in Phrygia, to the memory of five persons who purchased the grave together, ending with the notice: "Up to this stella the eastern portion of the area is common to all the Brethren." In Heraclea, in Pontus, an inscription imposes a fine of 300 denarii to be paid into the coffer of the "Brethren" by any one who introduces another body into a certain tomb. At Salona the fine was to be paid to the "Church of Salona." Finally in Rome, in the Kircherian museum, an epitaph says: "I beseech you, good brethren, by the One God, not to disturb this monument after my death."

---

[7] Modicum unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel cum velit, et si modo possit, apponit, * * * egenis alendis humandisque (Tertullian. Apolog. c: xxxix.)

The conclusion which De Rossi draws not as certain, but as highly probable, is that the members of the Christian guilds called themselves "Fratres" Brethren, and that the legal denomination of the Christian corporate associations was "Ecclesia Fratrum," the Church of the Brethren. This is plainly implied in the words of a Christian apologist, writing to pagans: "You are jealous of the name of Brothers which we call ourselves, as children of one Father, God, and heirs of the same hope."

Whatever may have been the legal denomination of the Christian corporations, it is beyond all doubt that in the third century the Church, either by the toleration of the Emperors or by some legal contrivance eluding prohibitive laws, held possession of churches and cemeteries; and that this possession was formally recognized by the Emperors, sometimes intervening with their authority to protect them, sometimes decreeing the confiscation of their corporate property and sometimes restoring it to the management of the Church. The confiscations did not suppose the tenure illegal or the possession of property a violation of law, or abusive; but rather supposed it to be a right which for motives of policy or caprice was to be abolished or suspended. Alexander Severus not only encouraged corporations of artisans, but not content with the passive toleration of his predecessors with regard to Christians, issued an edict forbidding them to be troubled: "Christianos esse non læsit." He himself decided a suit between the *popinarii,* victuallers, and the Christians in favor of the latter, treating both societies as equally entitled to plead in a corporate quality. The same Emperor confirmed the Christians in possession of their meeting place on the other side of the Tiber; and what is more singular, the Christians of Antioch had recourse to the Emperor Aurelian to have the heretic Paul of Samosata expelled from "the house of the Church," after he had been canonically deprived of his see.

Availing himself of the mild reigns of Severus and the two Philips, Pope Fabius divided the superintendence of the cemeteries among the seven deacons and ordered many constructions on the cemeterial land, *cellæ* and *memoriæ* above ground, and basilicas. He was martyred in 250 under Decius. An edict of Valerian of the year 257 forbade the use of the cemeteries. All visits to them and meetings were prohibited. The places for religious assembly, as distinct from the cemeteries, were confiscated and sold for the benefit of the State. This edict was revoked three years later by Gallienus, who ordered the restitution of the places of religious meeting to the Bishops of the various churches, directing special rescripts to the provinces. The edicts of Aurelian against the Church, issued shortly after he had legally recognized it, and sanctioned its possession of property even more formally than Alexander Severus, gave the Christians the measure of security they could depend on as soon as the new society became considerable enough to attract attention. It was then that the system of concealment began. The ordinary entrances to the cemeteries were closed, the staircases interrupted, the galleries obstructed when they led to tombs where the more cherished martyrs reposed: circuitous passages were excavated leading to remote large chambers, where the religious offices were held; mysterious outlets were contrived connected with arenaria or sandpits through which communication with the open air was possible without causing suspicion; everything was done to protect the inviolability of the graves and provide for the safety of the living who either for devotion or for temporary shelter betook themselves to the catacombs.

That the cemeteries were places of meeting and prayer, though by no means the only ones, is attested by writers of the times of persecution, as Tertullian, the author of the "Philosophumena," of "The Life of Pope Fabius," the letters of St. Cyprian and the edicts of the Emperors, interdicting or restoring their use. The interment of a Christian was itself a religious rite; the body was reverently washed, anointed and separately laid in the ground, with psalms and canticles, and the oblation of the Holy Sacrifice; the anniversary of the death or deposition was carefully observed, and with special solemnity in the case of martyrs; all this from faith in the resurrection.

The crypts that kept these venerable deposits drew crowds when the *dies natalis* returned, and became true sanctuaries, where the marble slab that covered the precious remains served at one and the same time for the Table of the Christ's Sacrament and the faithful custodian of His martyr's bones. No wonder that, when danger drove the faithful from the tituli in the city they found it no hardship to worship in these subterranean basilicas, surrounded by those they had loved on earth, revered in death, with whom they were still joined in communion, as they hoped to be united in sharing their crown.

Just in this second half of the third century Pope Sixtus II. is discovered in the cemetery of Prætextatus presiding at an ordination of clergy, taken and beheaded in his episcopal chair; St. Emerentiana, still a catechumen, praying at the tomb of her foster-sister Agnes, martyred a few days before, received the baptism of her blood, stoned to death; St. Candida cast down a luminare and overwhelmed with stones. It was during the reign of Valerian that Hippolytus lived in hiding on the Appian Way and instructed neophytes in the catacomb, where with many companions and the repentant traitor who betrayed them he suffered martyrdom. Under the same Emperor, or under Numerian, the martyrs Chrysanthus and Daria were slain in an arenarium, and shortly after, during the celebration of the sacred mysteries at their tomb, the persecutors came upon a multitude of the faithful assembled, and casting stones and earth from above, buried them alive. Long after, St. Gregory of Tours visited the spot, and through the protecting bars of a grating saw the remains of the martyred congregation lying, as they fell, with the sacred vessels scattered on the ground.

The second half of the third century passed in a succession of intervals of toleration and persecution. Dionysius the successor of Sixtus II., recovered the *Tituli* in Rome, as well as the cemeteries in the suburbs, and redistributed them among the clergy, assigning to each Titulus or parish its particular cemetery; the deacons having the temporal administration, the priests the spiritual jurisdiction over both. Even Diocletian, at the beginning of his reign, so encouraged by his toleration the confidence of the Christians, that they went on building and extending the cemeteries. To this period many of the staircases, light shafts and other constructions in masonry throughout the catacombs seem to belong. In the cemetery of Callixtus there is a large double chamber, well lighted and once lavishly decorated, built, as an inscription still preserved testifies, in the Pontificate of Marcellinus, by the deacon Severus.

In 303 toleration changed into fierce hostility. The churches were burned, the records destroyed, the *cellæ* at the cemeteries demolished and the land over the cemeteries confiscated. In this time of danger Priscilla the younger excavated the lowest and most hidden galleries of the catacomb called by her name on the Salarian Way.

The persecution ended in 306, but it was not till 311 that restitution was made to Pope Melchiades as the recognized chief of the Christian community, a proof that the confiscated property was acknowledged to be a corporate possession, and not of individuals. The Tituli restored were twenty-five, and to each corresponded a cemetery, or a region of a cemetery. That this was all regarded as corporate property is made still more clear by text of the decree of Constantine and Licinius: "The Christians are known to have possessed property which belonged to them as a body, that is, to their churches, not to individuals."[8]

From this date the possession of the catacombs was never questioned. In them and over them additions were made, chiefly during the century and a half in which they continued to be used as burial places; but the decoration of particular tombs and the opening of more convenient approaches continued till the ninth century, when the bodies of the great bulk of the martyrs were transferred to the city churches.

Enough has been said to establish that during the three hundred years of persecution Christians were free to bury their dead in land of their own; that at the beginning the land was the property of rich families, who allowed graves to be opened for the poor of their faith; that later under the form of burial associations they could combine to hold their cemeteries in collegiate name, and that, finally, the Church, as a corporate body (whether as the "Ecclesia Fratrum" or under another designation), came to be recognized before the Roman law as the responsible owner of the cemeteries and of all the edifices erected on the land in which they were excavated.

J. A. Campbell.

Rome, Italy.

---

[8] Et quoniam iidem Christiani non loca tantum, ad quae convenire consueverunt, sed alia etiam habuisse noscuntur ,ad jus corporis eorum, id est, Ecclesiarum, non hominum singulorum, pertinentia; ea omnia lege qua superius, comprehendimus, citra ullam prorsus ambiguitatem vel controversiam iisdem Christianis, id est, corpori et conventiculis eorum reddi jubebis, etc. (Lactantius, De mort. persecutorum, xlviii.)

DE IESV CHRISTO REDEMPTORE.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS, PATRIARCHIS, PRIMATIBUS, ARCHIEPISCOPIS, EPISCOPIS ALIISQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIIS PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

TAMETSI futura prospicientibus, vacuo a sollicitudine animo esse non licet, immo vero non paucae sunt nec leves extimescendae formidines, cum tot tamque inveteratae malorum caussae et privatim et publice insideant: tamen spei ac solatii aliquid videntur haec extrema saeculi divino munere peperisse. Nemo enim existimet, nihil habere ad communem salutem momenti renovatam cogitationem bonorum animi, fideique et pietatis christianae excitata studia: quas quidem virtutes revirescere apud complures aut corroborari hoc tempore, satis expressa signa testantur. En quippe in medio illecebrarum saeculi ac tot circumiectis pietati offensionibus, tamen uno nutu Pontificis undique commeare Romam ad limina sanctorum Apostolorum multitudo frequens: cives pariter ac peregrini dare palam religioni operam: oblataque Ecclesiae indulgentiâ confisi, parandae aeternae salutis artes studiosius exquirere. Quem praeterea ista non moveat, quae omnium obversatur oculis, erga humani generis Salvatorem solito magis incensa pietas? Optimis rei christianae temporibus facile dignus iudicabitur iste ardor animi tot hominum millium una voluntate sententiaque ab ortu ad solis occasum consalutantium nomen laudesque praedicantium Iesv Christi. Atque utinam istas avitae religionis velut erumpentes flammas magnum incendium consequatur: exemplumque excellens multorum reliquos permoveat universos. Quid enim tam huic aetati necessarium, quam redintegrari late in civitatibus indolem christianam, virtutesque veteres? Illud calamitosum, alios et quidem nimis multos obsurdescere, nec ea, quae ab eiusmodi pietatis renovatione monentur, audire. Qui tamen si "scirent donum Dei," si reputarent, nihil fieri posse miserius quam descivisse a liberatore orbis terrarum, moresque et instituta christiana deseruisse, utique exsuscitarent et ipsi sese, certissimumque interitum effugere converso itinere properarent.—Iamvero tueri in terris atque amplificare imperium Filii Dei, divinorumque beneficiorum communicatione ut homines salvi sint contendere, munus est Ecclesiae ita magnum atque ita suum, ut hoc in opere maxime omnis eius auctoritas ac potestas consistat. Id Nos in administratione Pontificatus maximi, perdifficili illa quidem ac plena curarum, videmur ad hunc diem pro viribus studuisse: vobis autem, venerabiles Fratres, usitatum certe est, immo quotidianum, praecipuas cogitationes vigiliasque in eodem negotio Nobiscum consumere. Verum utrique debemus pro conditione temporum etiam maiora conari, nominatimque per sacri opportunitatem Anni disseminare latius notitiam atque amorem Iesu Christi, docendo, suadendo, hortando, si forte exaudiri vox nostra queat, non tam eis, dicimus, qui effata christiana accipere pronis auribus consuevere, quam ceteris omnibus longe miserrimis, christianum retinentibus nomen, vitam sine fide, sine amore Christi agitantibus. Horum Nos maxime miseret: hos nominatim velimus, et quid agant et quorsum evasuri sint, nî resipuerint, attendere.

Iesum Christum nullo unquam tempore nullaque ratione novisse, summa infelicitas est, vacat tamen pervicacia atque ingrati animi vitio: repudiare aut oblivisci iam cognitum, id vero scelus est adeo tetrum atque insanum, ut in hominem cadere vix posse videatur. Principium enim atque origo ille est omnium bonorum: humanumque genus, quemadmodum sine Christi beneficio liberari nequiverat, ita nec conservari sine eius virtute potest. "Non est in alio aliquo salus. Nec enim aliud nomen est sub caelo datum hominibus, in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri." (Act iv., 12.) Quae vita mortalium sit, unde exsulet Iesus, "Dei virtus et Dei sapientia," qui mores, quae extrema rerum non satis docent exemplo suo expertes christiani luminis gentes? Quarum qui parumper meminerit vel adumbratam apud Paulum (Ad Rom. I.) caecitatem mentis, depravationem naturae, portenta superstitionum ac libidinum, is profecto defixum misericordia simul atque horrore animum sentiat.—Comperta vulgo sunt, quae memoramus hoc loco, non tamen meditata, nec cogitata vulgo. Neque enim tam multos abalienaret superbia, aut socordia languefaceret, si divinorum beneficiorum late memoria coleretur, saepiusque repeteret animus, unde hominem Christus eripuit, et quo provexit. Exheres atque exsul tot iam aetates in interitum gens humana quotidie rapiebatur, formidolosis illis aliisque implicata malis, quae primorum parentum pepererat delictum, nec ea erant ulla humana ope sanabilia, quo tempore Christus Dominus, demissus e caelo liberator, apparuit. Eum quidem victorem domitoremque serpentis futurum, Deus ipse in primo mundi ortu spoponderat: inde in adventum eius intueri acri cum expectatione desiderii saecula consequentia. In eo spem omnem repositam, sacrorum fata vatum perdiu ac luculente cecinerant: quin etiam lecti cuiusdam populi varia fortuna, res gestae, instituta, leges, ceremoniae, sacrificia, distincte ac dilucide praesignificaverant, salutem hominum generi perfectam absolutamque in eo fore, qui sacerdos tradebatur futurus, idemque hostia piacularis, restitutor humanae libertatis, princeps pacis, doctor universarum gentium, regni conditor in aeternitate temporum permansuri. Quibus et titulis et imaginibus et vaticiniis specie variis, re concinentibus, ille designabatur unus, qui propter nimiam caritatem suam qua dilexit nos, pro salute nostra sese aliquando devoveret. Sane cum divini venisset maturitas consilii, unigenitus Filius Dei, factus homo, violato Patris numini cumulatissime pro hominibus uberrimeque satisfecit de sanguine suo, tantoque redemptum pretio vindicavit sibi genus humanum. "Non corruptibilibus auro vel argento redempti estis: . . . sed pretioso sanguine quasi agni immaculati Christi, et incontaminati." (I. Pet. i., 18-19.) Ita omnes in universum homines potestati iam imperioque suo subiectos, quod cunctorum ipse et conditor est et conservator, vere proprieque redimendo, rursus fecit iuris sui. "Non estis vestri: empti enim estis pretio magno." (I. Cor. vi., 19-20.) Hinc a Deo instaurata in Christo omnia. "Sacramentum voluntatis suae, secundum beneplacitum eius, quod proposuit in eo, in dispensatione plenitudinis temporum instaurare omnia in Christo." (Eph. i., 9-10.) Cum delesset Iesus chirographum decreti, quod erat contrarium nobis, affigens illud cruci, continuo quievere caelestes irae; conturbato errantique hominum generi antiquae servitutis liberata nexa, Dei reconciliata voluntas, reddita gratia, reclusus aeternae beatitudinis aditus, eiusque potiundae et ius restitutum et instrumenta praebita. Tum velut excitatus e veterno quodam diuturno ac mortifero dispexit homo lumen veritatis concupitum per tot saecula quaesitumque frustra: in primisque agnovit, ad bona se multo altiora multoque magnificentiora natum quam haec sint, quae sensibus percipiuntur, fragilia et fluxa, quibus cogitationes curasque suas antea finierat: atque hanc omnino esse humanae constitutionem vitae, hanc legem supremam, huc tamquam ad finem omnia referenda, ut a Deo profecti, ad Deum aliquando revertamur. Ex hoc initio et fundamento recreata revixit conscientia dignitatis humanae: sensum fraternae omnium necessitudinis excepere pectora: tum officia et iura, id quod erat consequens, partim ad perfectionem adducta, partim ex integro constituta, simulque tales excitatae passim virtutes, quales ne suspicari quidem ulla veterum philosophia potuisset. Quamobrem consilia, actio vitae, mores, in alium abiere cursum: cumque Redemptoris late fluxisset cognitio, atque in intimas civitatum venas virtus eius, expultrix ignorantiae ac vitiorum veterum, permanasset, tum ea est conversio rerum consecuta, quae, christiana gentium humanitate parta, faciem orbis terrarum funditus commutavit.

Istarum in recordatione rerum quaedam inest, venerabiles

Fratres, infinita iucunditas, pariterque magna vis admonitionis, scilicet ut habeamus toto animo, referendamque curemus, ut potest, divino Servatori gratim.

Remoti ob vetustatem sumus ab originibus primordiisque restitutae salutis: quid tamen istuc referat, quando redemptionis perpetua virtus est, perenniaque et immortalia manent beneficia? Qui naturam peccato perditam reparavit semel, servat idem servabitque in perpetuum; "Dedit redemptionem semetipsum pro omnibus . . . ." (I. Tim. ii., 6.) "In Christo omnes vivificabuntur . . . ." (I. Cor. xv., 22.) "Et regni eius non erit finis." (Luc. i., 33.) Itaque ex aeterno Dei consilio, omnis est in Christo Iesu cum singulorum, tum universorum posita salus: eum qui deserunt, hoc ipso exitium sibi privatim coeco furore consciscunt, eodemque tempore committunt, quantum est in se, ut quam malorum calamitatumque molem pro pietate sua Redemptor depulerat, ad eam ipsam convictus humanus magna iactatus tempestate relabatur.

Rapiuntur enim errore vago optata, ab meta longius, quicumque in itinera se devia coniecerint. Similiter si lux veri pura et sincera respuatur, offundi caliginem mentibus, miseraque opinionum pravitate passim infatuari animos necesse est. Spes autem sanitatis quota potest esse reliqua iis, qui principium et fontem vitae deserant? Atqui via, veritas et vita Christus est unice. "Ego sum via, et veritas, et vita" (Io. xiv., 6): ita ut, eo posthabito, tria illa ad omnem salutem necessaria principia tollantur.

Num disserere est opus, quod ipsa res monet assidue, quodque vel in maxima mortalium bonorum affluentia in se quisque penitus sentit, nihil esse, praeter Deum, in quo voluntas humana absolute possit atque omni ex parte quiescere? Omnino finis homini, Deus: atque omnis haec, quae in terris degitur, aetas similitudinem peregrinationis cuiusdam atque imaginem verissime gerit. Iamvero via nobis Christus est, quia ex hoc mortali cursu, tam laborioso praesertim tamque ancipiti, ad summum et extremum bonorum, Deum, nulla ratione pervenire, nisi Christo auctore et duce, possumus. "Nemo venit ad Patrem, nisi per me." (Io. xiv., 6.) Quo modo nisi per eum? Nempe in primis et maxime, nisi per gratiam eius: quae tamen vacua in homine foret, neglectis praeceptis eius et legibus. Quod enim fieri, parta per Iesum Christum salute, oportebat, legem ipse suam reliquit custodem et procuratricem generis humani, qua nimirum gubernante, a vitae pravitate conversi, ad Deum homines suum securi contenderent. "Euntes docete omnes gentes: . . . docentes eos servare omnia quaecumque mandavi vobis. . . ." (Matt. xxviii., 19-20.) "Mandata mea servate." (Io. xiv., 15.) Ex quo intelligi debet, illud esse in professione christiana praecipuum planeque necessarium, praebere se ad Iesu Christi praecepta docilem eique, ut domino ac regi summo, obnoxiam ac devotam penitus gerere voluntatem. Magna res, et quae multum saepe laborem vehementemque contentionem et constantiam desiderat. Quamvis enim Redemptoris beneficio humana sit reparata natura, superstes tamen in unoquoque nostrum velut quaedam aegrotatio est, infirmitas ac vitiositas. Appetitus varii huc atque illuc hominem rapiunt, rerumque externarum illecebrae facile impellunt animum ut, quod lubeat, non quod a Christo imperatum sit, sequatur. Atqui tamen contra nitendum, atque omnibus viribus repugnandum est cupiditatibus "in obsequium Christi:" quae, nisi parent rationi, dominantur, totumque hominem Christo ereptum, sibi faciunt servientem. "Homines corrupti mente, reprobi circa fidem, non efficiunt ut non serviant, . . . serviunt enim cupiditati triplici, vel voluptatis, vel excellentiae, vel spectaculi." (S. Aug. De vera rel., 37.) Atque in eiusmodi certamine sic quisque affectus esse debet, ut molestias etiam et incommoda sibi suscipienda, Christi caussa, putet. Difficile, quae tanto opere alliciunt atque oblectant, repellere: durum atque asperum ea, quae putantur bona corporis et fortunae, prae Christi domini voluntate imperioque contemnere: sed omnino christianum hominem oportet patientem et fortem esse in perferendo, si vult hoc, quod datum est vitae, christiane traducere. Oblitine sumus cuius corporis et cuius capitis simus membra? Proposito sibi gaudio sustinuit crucem, qui nobis ut nosmetipsos abnegaremus praescripsit. Ex ea vero affectione animi, quam diximus, humanae naturae dignitas pendet ipsa. Quod enim vel sapientia antiquorum saepe vidit, imperare sibi efficereque ut pars animi inferior obediat superiori, nequaquam est fractae voluntatis demissio, sed potius quaedam generosa virtus rationi mirifice congruens, in primisque homine digna.—Ceterum, multa ferre et perpeti, humana conditio est. Vitam sibi dolore vacuam atque omni expletam beatitate extruere non plus homo potest, quam divini conditoris sui delere consilia, qui culpae veteris consectaria voluit manere perpetua. Consentaneum est ergo, non expectare in terris finem doloris, sed firmare animum ad ferendum dolorem, quo scilicet ad spem certam maximorum bonorum erudimur. Neque enim opibus aut vitae delicatiori, neque honoribus aut potentiae, sed patientiae et lacrimis, studio iustitiae et mundo cordi sempiternam in caelo beatitudinem Christus assignavit.

Hinc facile apparet quid sperari denique ex eorum errore superbiaque debeat, qui, spreto Redemptoris principatu, in summo rerum omnium fastigio hominem locant, atque imperare humanam naturam omni ratione atque in omnes partes statuunt oportere: quamquam id regnum non modo assequi, sed nec definire, quale sit, queunt. Iesu Christi regnum a divina caritate vim et formam sumit: diligere sancte atque ordine, eius est fundamentum et summa. Ex quo illa necessario fluunt, officia inviolate servare: nihil alteri de iure detrahere: humana caelestibus inferiora ducere: amorem Dei rebus omnibus anteponere. Sed isthaec dominatio hominis, aut aperte Christum reiicientis aut non curantis agnoscere, tota nititur in amore sui, caritatis expers, devotionum nescia. Imperet quidem homo, per Iesum Christum licet: sed eo, quo solo potest, pacto, ut primum omnium serviat Deo, eiusque ab lege normam religiose petat disciplinamque vivendi.

Legem vero Christi dicimus non solum praecepta morum naturalia, aut ea quae accepere antiqui divinitus, quae utique Iesus Christus omnia perfecit et ad summum adduxit declarando, interpretando, sanciendo: verum etiam doctrinam eius reliquam, et omnes nominatim ab eo res institutas. Quarum profecto rerum caput est Ecclesia: immo ullaene res numerantur Christo auctore institutae, quas non illa cumulate complectatur et contineat? Porro Ecclesiae ministerio, praeclarissime ab se fundatae, perennare munus assignatum sibi a Patre voluit: cumque ex una parte praesidia salutis humanae in eam omnia contulisset, ex altera gravissime sanxit, ei ut homines perinde subessent ac sibimetipsi, eamdemque studiose et in omni vita sequerentur ducem: "qui vos audit, me audit: et qui vos spernit, me spernit." (Luc. x., 16.) Quocirca omnino petenda ab Ecclesia lex Christi est: ideoque via homini Christus, via item Ecclesia: ille per se et natura sua; haec, mandato munere et communicatione potestatis. Ob eam rem quicumque ad salutem contendere seorsum ab Ecclesia velint, falluntur errore viae, frustraque contendunt.

Quae autem privatorum hominum, eadem fere est caussa imperiorum: haec enim ipsa in exitus perniciosos incurrere necesse est, si digrediantur de via. Humanae procreator idemque redemptor naturae, Filius Dei, rex et dominus est orbis terrarum, potestatemque summam in homines obtinet cum singulos, tum iure sociatos. "Dedit ei potestatem, et honorem, et regnum: et omnes populi, tribus et linguae ipsi servient." (Daniel vii., 14.) "Ego autem constitutus sum rex ab eo. . . . Dabo tibi gentes haereditatem tuam, et possessionem tuam terminos terrae." (Ps. ii.) Debet ergo in convictu humano et societate lex valere Christi, ita ut non privatae tantum ea sit, sed et publicae dux et magistra vitae. Quoniamque id ita est provisum et constitutum divinitus, nec repugnare quisquam impune potest, idcirco male consulitur rei publicae ubicumque instituta christiana non eo, quo debent, habeantur loco. Amoto Iesu, destituitur sibi humana ratio, maximo orbata praesidio et lumine: tum ipsa facile obscuratur notio caussae, quae caussa, Deo auctore, genuit communem societatem, quaeque in hoc consistit maxime ut, civili coniunctione adiutrice, consequantur cives naturale bonum, sed prorsus summo illi, quod supra naturam est, perfectissimoque et perpetuo bono convenienter. Occupatis rerum confusione mentibus, ingrediuntur itinere devio tam qui parent, quam qui imperant: abest enim quod tuto sequantur, et in quo consistant.

Quo pacto miserum et calamitosum aberrare de via, simillime deserere veritatem. Prima autem et absoluta et essentialis veritas Christus est, utpote Verbum Dei, consubstantiale et coaeternum Patri, unum ipse et Pater. "Ego sum via, et veritas." Itaque, si verum quaeritur, pareat primum omnium Iesu Christo, in eiusque magisterio secura conquiescat humana ratio, propterea quod Christi voce loquitur ipsa veritas.—Innumerabilia genera sunt, in quibus humani facultas ingenii, velut in uberrimo campo et quidem suo, investigando contemplandoque, libere excurrat, idque non solum concedente, sed plane postulante natura. Illud nefas et contra naturam, contineri mentem nolle finibus suis, abiectâque modestia debita, Christi docentis aspernari auctoritatem. Doctrina ea, unde nostra omnium pendet salus, fere de Deo est rebusque divinissimis: neque sapientia hominis cuiusquam peperit eam, sed Filius Dei ipso ab Patre suo totam hausit atque accepit: "Verba quae dedisti mihi, dedi eis." (Io. xvii., 8.) Idcirco plura necessario complectitur, non quae rationi dissentiant, id enim fieri nullo pacto potest, sed quorum altitudinem cogitatione assequi non magis possumus, quam comprehendere, qualis est in se, Deum. At enim si tam multae res existunt occultae et a natura ipsa involutae, quas nulla queat humana explicare sollertia, de quibus tamen nemo sanus dubitare ausit, erit quidem libertate perverse utentium non ea perferre quae supra universam naturam longe sunt posita, quod percipere qualia sint non licet. Nolle dogmata huc plane recidit, christianam religionem nullam esse velle. Porro flectenda mens demisse et obnoxie "in obsequium Christi," usque adeo, ut eius numine imperioque velut captiva teneatur: "In captivitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi." (II. Cor. x., 5.) Tale prorsus obsequium est, quod Christus sibi tributum vult; et iure vult, Deus est enim, propter eaque sicut voluntatis in homine, ita et intelligentiae unus habet summum imperium. Serviens autem intelligentiâ Christo domino, nequaquam facit homo serviliter, sed maxime convenienter tum rationi, tum nativae excellentiae suae. Nam voluntate in imperium concedit non hominis cuiuspiam, sed auctoris sui ac principis omnium Dei, cui subiectus est lege naturae: nec astringi se humani opinatione magistri patitur, sed aeterna atque immutabili veritate. Ita et mentis naturale bonum, et libertatem simul consequitur. Veritas enim, quae a Christi magisterio proficiscitur, in conspicuo ponit, unaquaeque res qualis in se sit et quanti: qua imbutus cognitione, si perceptae veritati paruerit homo, non se rebus, sed sibi res, nec rationem libidini, sed libidinem rationi subiiciet: peccatique et errorum pessima servitute depulsa, in libertatem praestantissimam vindicabitur: "Cognoscetis veritatem, et veritas liberabit vos." (Io. viii., 32.)—Apparet igitur, quorum mens imperium Christi recusat, eos pervicaci voluntate contra Deum contendere. Elapsi autem e potestate divina, non propterea solutiores futuri sunt: incident in potestatem aliquam humanam: eligent quippe, ut fit, unum aliquem, quem audiant, cui obtemperent, quem sequantur magistrum. Ad haec, mentem suam, a rerum divinarum communicatione seclusam, in angustiorem scientiae gyrum compellunt, et ad ea ipsa, quae ratione cognoscuntur, venient minus instructi ad proficiendum. Sunt enim in natura rerum non pauca, quibus vel percipiendis, vel explicandis plurimum affert divina doctrina luminis. Nec raro, poenas de superbia sumpturus, sinit illos Deus non vera cernere, ut in quo peccant, in eo plectantur. Utraque de caussa permultos saepe videre licet magnis ingeniis exquisitaque eruditione praeditos, tamen in ipsa exploratione naturae tam absurda consectantes, ut nemo deterius erraverit.

Certum igitur sit, intelligentiam in vita christiana auctoritati divinae totam et penitus esse tradendam. Quod si in eo quod ratio cedit auctoritati, elatior ille animus, qui tantam habet in nobis vim, comprimitur et dolet aliquid, inde magis emergit, magnam esse in christiano oportere non voluntatis dumtaxat, sed etiam mentis tolerantiam. Atque id velimus meminisse, qui cogitatione sibi fingunt ac plane mallent quamdam in christiana professione et sentiendi disciplinam et agendi, cuius essent praecepta molliora, quaeque humanae multo indulgentior naturae, nullam in nobis tolerantiam requireret, aut mediocrem. Non satis vim intelligunt fidei institutorumque christianorum: non vident, undique nobis occurrere Crucem, exemplum vitae vexillumque perpetuum iis omnibus futurum, qui re ac factis, non tantum nomine, sequi Christum velint.

Vitam esse, solius est Dei. Ceterae naturae omnes participes vitae sunt, vita non sunt. Ex omni autem aeternitate ac suapte naturâ vita Christus est, quo modo est veritas, quia Deus de Deo. Ab ipso, ut ab ultimo augustissimoque principio, vita omnis in mundum influxit perpetuoque influet: quidquid est, per ipsum est, quidquid vivit, per ipsum vivit, quia omnia per Verbum "facta sunt, et sine ipso factum est nihil quod factum est."—Id quidem in vita naturae: sed multo meliorem vitam multoque potiorem satis iam tetigimus supra, Christi ipsius beneficio partam, nempe vitam gratiae, cuius beatissimus est exitus vita gloriae, ad quam cogitationes atque actiones referendae omnes. In hoc est omnis vis doctrinae legumque christianarum ut "peccatis mortui, iustitiae vivamus" (I. Pet. ii., 24), id est virtuti et sanctitati, in quo moralis vita animorum cum explorata spe beatitudinis sempiternae consistit. Sed vere et proprie et ad salutem apte nulla re alia, nisi fide christiana, alitur iustitia. "Iustus ex fide vivit." (Galat. iii., 11.) "Sine fide impossibile est placere Deo." (Hebr. xi., 6.) Itaque sator et parens et altor fidei Iesus Christus, ipse est qui vitam in nobis moralem conservat ac sustentat: idque potissimum Ecclesiae ministerio: huic enim, benigno providentissimoque consilio, administranda instrumenta tradidit, quae hanc, de qua loquimur, vitam gignerent, generatam tuerentur, extinctam renovarent. Vis igitur procreatrix eademque conservatrix virtutum salutarium eliditur, si disciplina morum a fide divina diiungitur: ac sane despoliant hominem dignitate maxima, vitaque deiectum supernaturali ad naturalem perniciossissime revolvunt, qui mores dirigi ad honestatem uno rationis magisterio volunt. Non quod praecepta naturae dispicere ac servare recta ratione homo plura non queat: sed omnia quamvis dispiceret et sine ulla offensione in omni vita servaret, quod nisi opitulante Redemptoris gratia non potest, tamen frustra quisquam, expers fidei, de salute sempiterna confideret. "Si quis in me non manserit, mittetur foras sicut palmes; et arescet, et colligent eum, et in ignem mittent, et ardet." (Io. xv., 6.) "Qui non crediderit, condemnabitur." (Marc. xvi., 16.) Ad extremum quanti sit in se ipsa, et quos pariat fructus ista divinae fidei contemptrix honestas, nimis multa habemus documenta ante oculos. Quid est quod in tanto studio stabiliendae augendaeque prosperitatis publicae, laborant tamen ac paene aegrotant civitates tam multis in rebus tamque gravibus quotidie magis? Utique civilem societatem satis aiunt fretam esse per se ipsam: posse sine praesidio institutorum christianorum commode se habere, atque eo, quo spectat, uno labore suo pervenire. Hinc quae administrantur publice, ea more profano administrari malunt: ita ut in disciplina civili vitaque publica populorum vestigia religionis avitae pauciora quotidie videas. At non cernunt satis quid agant. Nam submoto numine recta et prava sancientis Dei, excidere auctoritate principe leges necesse est, iustitiamque collabi, quae duo firmissima sunt coniunctionis civilis maximeque necessaria vincula. Similique modo, sublata semel spe atque expectatione bonorum immortalium, pronum est mortalia sitienter appetere: de quibus trahere ad se, quanto plus poterit, conabitur quisque pro viribus. Hinc aemulari, invidere, odisse; tum consilia teterrima: de gradu deiectam velle omnem potestatem, meditari passim dementes ruinas. Non pacatae res foris, non securitas domi: deformata sceleribus vita communis.

In tanto cupiditatum certamine, tantoque discrimine, aut extrema metuenda pernicies, aut idoneum quaerendum mature remedium.

Coercere maleficos, vocare ad mansuetudinem mores populares atque omni ratione deterrere a delictis providentiâ legum, rectum idemque necessarium: nequaquam tamen in isto omnia. Altius sanatio petenda populorum: advocanda vis humanâ maior, quae attingat animos, renovatosque ad conscientiam officii, efficiat meliores: ipsa illa nimirum vis, quae multo maioribus fessum malis vindicavit semel ab interitu orbem terrarum. Fac reviviscere et valere, amotis impedimentis, christianos in civitate spiritus; recreabitur civitas. Conticescere proclive erit inferiorum ordinum cum superioribus contentionem, ac sancta utrinque iura consistere verecundiâ mutuâ. Si Christum audiant, manebunt in officio fortunati aeque ac miseri: alteri iustitiam et caritatem sentient sibi esse servandam, si salvi esse volunt, alteri temperantiam et modum. Optime constiterit domestica societas, custode salutari metu iubentis, vetantis Dei: eademque ratione plurimum illa in populis valebunt, quae ab ipsa natura praecipiuntur, vereri potestatem legitimam et obtemperare legibus ius esse: nihil seditiose facere, nec per coitiones moliri quicquam. Ita, ubi christiana lex omnibus praesit et eam nulla res impediat, ibi sponte fit ut conservetur ordo divina providentia constitutus, unde efflorescit cum incolumitate prosperitas. Clamat ergo communis salus, referre se necesse esse, unde numquam digredi oportuerat, ad eum qui via et veritas et vita est, nec singulos dumtaxat, sed societatem humanam universe. In hanc velut in possessionem suam, restitui Christum dominum oportet, efficiendumque ut profectam ab eo vitam hauriant atque imbibant omnia membra et partes reipublicae, iussa ac vetita legum, instituta popularia, domicilia doctrinae, ius coniugiorum convictusque domestici, tecta locupletium, officinae opificum. Nec fugiat quemquam, ex hoc pendere magnopere ipsam, quae tam vehementer expetitur, gentium humanitatem, quippe quae alitur et augetur non tam iis rebus, quae sunt corporis, commoditatibus et copiis, quam iis, quae sunt animi, laudabilibus moribus et cultu virtutum.

Alieni a Iesu Christo plerique sunt ignoratione magis, quam voluntate improba: qui enim hominem, qui mundum studeant dedita opera cognoscere, quam plurimi numerantur; qui Filium Dei, perpauci. Primum igitur sit, ignorationem scientiâ depellere, ne repudietur aut spernatur ignotus. Quotquot ubique sunt, christianos obtestamur dare velint operam, quoad quisque potest, Redemptorem suum ut noscant, qualis est: in quem ut quis intuebitur mente sincera iudicioque integro, ita perspicue cernet nec eius lege fieri quicquam posse salubrius, nec doctrinâ divinius. In quo mirum quantum allatura adiumenti est auctoritas atque opera vestra, venerabiles Fratres, tum Cleri totius studium et sedulitas. Insculpere populorum in animis germanam notionem ac prope imaginem Iesu

Christi, eiusque caritatem, beneficia, instituta illustrare litteris, sermone, in scholis puerilibus, in gymnasiis, in concione, ubicumque se det occasio, partes officii vestri praecipuas putatote. De iis, quae appelantur iura hominis, satis audiit multitudo: audiat aliquando de iuribus Dei. Idoneum tempus esse, vel ipsa indicant excitata iam, ut diximus, multorum recta studia, atque ista nominatim in Redemptorem tot significationibus testata pietas, quam quidem saeculo insequenti, si Deo placet, in auspicium melioris aevi tradituri sumus. Verum, cum res agatur quam non aliunde sperare nisi a gratia divina licet, communi studio summisque precibus flectere ad misericordiam insistamus omnipotentem Deum, ut interire ne patiatur, quos ipsemet profuso sanguine liberavit: respiciat hanc propitius aetatem, quae multum quidem deliquit, sed multa vicissim ad patiendum aspera in expiationem exanclavit: omniumque gentium generumque homines benigne complexus, meminerit suum illud: "Ego si exaltatus fuero a terra, omnia traham ad meipsum." (Io. xii., 32.)

Auspicem divinorum munerum, benevolentiaeque Nostrae paternae testem vobis, venerabiles Fratres, Clero populoque vestro Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die 1 Novembris An MDCCCC., Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo tertio.

LEO PP. XIII.

JESUS CHRIST OUR REDEEMER.

To Our Venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs, Primates,
Archbishops, Bishops and other Local Ordinaries
having Peace and Communion with
the Holy See.

LEO XIII., POPE.

Venerable Brethren,
Health and the Apostolic Benediction.

THE outlook on the future is by no means free from anxiety; on the contrary, there are many serious reasons for alarm, on account of numerous and long-standing causes of evil, of both a public and a private nature. Nevertheless, the close of the century really seems in God's mercy to afford us some degree of consolation and hope. For no one will deny that renewed interest in spiritual matters and a revival of Christian faith and piety are influences of great moment for the common good. And there are suffi-

ciently clear indications at the present day of a very general revival or augmentation of these virtues. For example, in the very midst of worldly allurements and in spite of so many obstacles to piety, what great crowds have flocked to Rome to visit the "Threshold of the Apostles" at the invitation of the Sovereign Pontiff! Both Italians and foreigners are openly devoting themselves to religious exercises, and, relying upon the indulgences offered by the Church, are most earnestly seeking the means to secure their eternal salvation. Who could fail to be moved by the present evident increase of devotion towards the person of Our Saviour? The ardent zeal of so many thousands, united in heart and mind, "from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof," in venerating the Name of Jesus Christ and proclaiming His praises, is worthy of the best days of Christianity. Would that the outburst of these flames of antique faith might be followed by a mighty conflagration! Would that the splendid example of so many might kindle the enthusiasm of all! For what so necessary for our times as a widespread renovation among the nations of Christian principles and old-fashioned virtues? The great misfortune is that too many turn a deaf ear and will not listen to the teachings of this revival of piety. Yet, "did they but know the gift of God," did they but realize that the greatest of all misfortunes is to fall away from the World's Redeemer and to abandon Christian faith and practice, they would be only too eager to turn back, and so escape certain destruction.

The most important duty of the Church, and the one most peculiarly her own, is to defend and to propagate throughout the world the Kingdom of the Son of God, and to bring all men to salvation by communicating to them the divine benefits, so much so that her power and authority are chiefly exercised in this one work. Towards this end we are conscious of having devoted our energies throughout our difficult and anxious Pontificate even to the present day. And you too, Venerable Brethren, are wont constantly, yea daily, to give your chief thoughts and endeavors together with ourselves to the self-same task. But at the present moment all of us ought to make still further efforts, more especially on the occasion of the Holy Year, to disseminate far and wide the better knowledge and love of Jesus Christ by teaching, persuading, exhorting, if perchance our voice can be heard; and this, not so much to those who are ever ready to listen willingly to Christian teachings, but to those most unfortunate men who, whilst professing the Christian name, live strangers to the faith and love of Christ. For these we feel the profoundest pity: these above all would we urge to think seriously of their present life and what its consequences will be if they do not repent.

The greatest of all misfortunes is never to have known Jesus Christ: yet such a state is free from the sin of obstinacy and ingratitude. But first to have known Him, and afterwards to deny or forget Him, is a crime so foul and so insane that it seems impossible for any man to be guilty of it. For Christ is the fountain-head of all good. Mankind can no more be saved without His power, than it could be redeemed without His mercy. "Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv., 12). What kind of life that is from which Jesus Christ, "the power of God and the wisdom of God," is excluded; what kind of morality and what manner of death are its consequences, can be clearly learnt from the example of nations deprived of the light of Christianity. If we but recall St. Paul's description (Romans i., 24-32) of the mental blindness, the natural depravity, the monstrous superstitions and lusts of such peoples, our minds will be filled with horror and pity. What we here record is well enough known, but not sufficiently realized or thought about. Pride would not mislead, nor indifference enervate, so many minds, if the Divine mercies were more generally called to mind and if it were remembered from what an abyss Christ delivered mankind and to what a height He raised it. The human race, exiled and disinherited, had for ages been daily hurrying into ruin, involved in the terrible and numberless ills brought about by the sin of our first parents, nor was there any human hope of salvation, when Christ Our Lord came down as the Saviour from Heaven. At the very beginning of the world, God had promised Him as the conqueror of "the Serpent," hence, succeeding ages had eagerly looked forward to His coming. The prophets had long and clearly declared that all hope was in Him. The varying fortunes, the achievements, customs, laws, ceremonies and sacrifices of the Chosen People had distinctly and lucidly foreshadowed the truth, that the salvation of mankind was to be accomplished in Him who should be the Priest, Victim, Liberator, Prince of Peace, Teacher of all Nations, Founder of an Eternal Kingdom. By all these titles, images and prophecies, differing in kind though like in meaning, He alone was designated who "for His exceeding charity wherewith He loved us," gave Himself up for our salvation. And so, when the fullness of time came in God's Divine Providence, the only-begotten Son of God became man, and in behalf of mankind made most abundant satisfaction in His Blood to the outraged majesty of His Father, and by this infinite price He redeemed man for His own. "You were not redeemed with corruptible things as gold or silver . . . but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a lamb, unspotted and undefiled" (I. Peter i., 18-19). Thus all men, though already subject to His kingly power, inasmuch as He is the Creator and Preserver of all, were over and above made His property by a true and real purchase. "You are not your own: for you are bought with a great price" (II. Corinthians vi., 19-20). Hence in Christ all things are made new. "The mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed to Him, in the dispensation of the fullness of times to re-establish all things in Christ" (Ephesians i., 9-10). When Jesus Christ had blotted out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, fastening it to the cross, at once God's wrath was appeased, the primeval fetters of slavery were struck off from unhappy and erring man, God's favor was won back, grace restored, the gates of Heaven opened, the right to enter them revived, and the means afforded of doing so. Then man, as though awakening from a long-continued and deadly lethargy, beheld at length the light of the truth, for long ages desired, yet sought in vain. First of all, he realized that he was born to much higher and more glorious things than the frail and inconstant objects of sense which had hitherto formed the end of his thoughts and cares. He learnt that the meaning of human life, the supreme law, the end of all things was this: that we come from God and must return to Him. From this first principle the consciousness of human dignity was revived: men's hearts realized the universal brotherhood: as a consequence, human rights and duties were either perfected or even newly created, whilst on all sides were evoked virtues undreamt of in pagan philosophy. Thus men's aims, life, habits and customs received a new direction. As the knowledge of the Redeemer spread far and wide and His power, which destroyeth ignorance and former vices, penetrated into the very life-blood of the nations, such a change came about that the face of the world was entirely altered by the creation of a Christian civilization. The remembrance of these events, Venerable Brethren, is full of infinite joy, but it also teaches us the lesson that we must both feel and render with our whole hearts gratitude to our Divine Saviour.

We are indeed now very far removed in time from the first beginnings of Redemption; but what difference does this make when the benefits thereof are perennial and immortal? He who once hath restored human nature ruined by sin the same preserveth and will preserve it forever. "He gave Himself a redemption for all" (I. Timothy ii., 6). "In Christ all shall be made alive" (I. Corinthians xv., 22). "And of His Kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i., 33). Hence by God's eternal decree the salvation of all men, both severally and collectively, depends upon Jesus Christ. Those who abandon Him become guilty by the very fact, in their blindness and folly, of their own ruin; whilst at the same time they do all that in them lies to bring about a violent reaction of mankind in the direction of that mass of evils and miseries from which the Redeemer in His mercy had freed them.

Those who go astray from the road wander far from the goal they aim at. Similarly, if the pure and true light of truth be rejected, men's minds must necessarily be darkened and their souls deceived by deplorably false ideas. What hope of salvation can they have who abandon the very principle and fountain of life? Christ alone is the Way, the Truth and the Life (John xiv., 6). If He be abandoned the three necessary conditions of salvation are removed.

It is surely unnecessary to prove, what experience constantly shows and what each individual feels in himself, even in the very midst of all temporal prosperity—that in God alone can the human will find absolute and perfect peace. God is the only end of man. All our life on earth is the truthful and exact image of a pilgrimage. Now Christ is the "Way," for we can never reach God, the supreme and ultimate good, by this toilsome and doubtful road of mortal life, except with Christ as our leader and guide. How so? Firstly and chiefly by His grace; but this would remain "void" in man if the precepts of His law were neglected. For, as was necessarily the case after Jesus Christ had won our salvation, He left behind Him His Law for the protection and welfare of the human race, under the guidance of which men, converted from evil life, might safely tend towards God. "Going, teach ye all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matthew xxviii., 19-20). "Keep My commandments" (John xiv., 15). Hence it will be understood that in the Christian religion the first and most necessary condition is docility to the precepts of Jesus Christ, absolute loyalty of will towards Him as Lord and King. A serious duty, and one which oftentimes calls for strenuous labor, earnest endeavor and perseverance! For although by Our Redeemer's grace human nature hath been regenerated, still there remains in each individual a certain debility and tendency to evil. Various natural appetites attract man on one side and the other; the allurements of the material world impel his soul to follow after what is pleasant rather than the law of Christ. Still we must strive our best and resist our natural inclinations with all our strength "unto the obedience of Christ." For unless they obey reason they become our masters, and carrying the whole man away from Christ, make him their slave. "Men of corrupt mind, who have made shipwreck of the faith, cannot help being slaves. . . . They are slaves to a threefold concupiscence: of will, of pride, or of outward show" (St. Augustine, *De Vera Religione*, 37). In this contest every man must be prepared to undergo hardships and troubles for Christ's sake. It is difficult to reject what so powerfully entices and delights. It is hard and painful to despise the supposed goods of the senses and of fortune for the will and precepts of Christ Our Lord. But the Christian is absolutely obliged to be firm, and patient in suffering, if he wish to lead a Christian life. Have we forgotten of what Body and of what Head we are the members? "Having joy set before Him, He endured the Cross," and He bade us deny ourselves. The very dignity of human nature depends upon this disposition of mind. For, as even the ancient pagan philosophy perceived, to be master of oneself and to make the lower part of the soul obey the superior part, is so far from being a weakness of will that it is really a noble power, in consonance with right reason and most worthy of a man. Moreover, to bear and to suffer is the ordinary condition of man. Man can no more create for himself a life free from suffering and filled with all happiness than he can abrogate the decrees of his Divine Maker, who has willed that the consequences of original sin should be perpetual. It is reasonable, therefore, not to expect an end to troubles in this world, but rather to steel one's soul to bear troubles, by which we are taught to look forward with certainty to supreme happiness. Christ has not promised eternal bliss in heaven to riches, nor to a life of ease, to honors or to power, but to long-suffering and to tears, to the love of justice and to cleanness of heart.

From this it may clearly be seen what consequences are to be expected from that false pride which, rejecting our Saviour's Kingship, places man at the summit of all things and declares that human nature must rule supreme. And yet this supreme rule can neither be attained nor even defined. The rule of Jesus Christ derives its form and its power from Divine Love: a holy and orderly charity is both its foundation and its crown. Its necessary consequences are the strict fulfilment of duty, respect of mutual rights, the estimation of the things of heaven above those of earth, the preference of the love of God to all things. But this supremacy of man, which openly rejects Christ, or at least ignores Him, is entirely founded upon selfishness, knowing neither charity nor self-devotion. Man may indeed be king, through Jesus Christ; but only on condition that he first of all obey God, and diligently seek his rule of life in God's law. By the law of Christ we mean not only the natural precepts of morality and the Ancient Law, all of which Jesus Christ has perfected and crowned by His declaration, explanation and sanction; but also the rest of His doctrine and His own peculiar institutions. Of these the chief is His Church. Indeed, whatsoever things Christ has instituted are most fully contained in His Church. Moreover, He willed to perpetuate the office assigned to Him by His Father by means of the ministry of the Church so gloriously founded by Himself. On the one hand He confided to her all the means of man's salvation; on the other He most solemnly commanded men to be subject to her and to obey her diligently, and to follow her even as Himself: "He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me" (Luke x., 16.) Wherefore the law of Christ must be sought in the Church. Christ is man's "Way;" the Church also is his "Way"—Christ of Himself and by His very nature, the Church by His commission and the communication of His power. Hence all who would find salvation apart from the Church are led astray and strive in vain.

As with individuals, so with nations. These, too, must necessarily tend to ruin if they go astray from "The Way." The Son of God, the Creator and Redeemer of mankind, is King and Lord of the earth, and holds supreme dominion over men, both individually and collectively. "And He gave Him power, and glory, and a kingdom: and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall serve Him" (Daniel vii., 14). "I am appointed King by Him. . . . I will give Thee the Gentiles for Thy inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession" (Psalm ii., 6, 8). Therefore the law of Christ ought to prevail in human society and be the guide and teacher of public as well as of private life. Since this is so by divine decree, and no man may with impunity contravene it, it is an evil thing for the common weal wherever Christianity does not hold the place that belongs to it. When Jesus Christ is absent, human reason fails, being bereft of its chief protection and light, and the very end is lost sight of for which, under God's providence, human society has been built up. This end is the obtaining by the members of society of natural good through the aid of civil unity, though always in harmony with the perfect and eternal good which is above nature. But when men's minds are clouded, both rulers and ruled go astray, for they have no safe line to follow nor end to aim at.

Just as it is the height of misfortune to go astray from the "Way," so is it to abandon the "Truth." Christ Himself is the first, absolute and essential "Truth," inasmuch as He is the Word of God, consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father, He and the Father being One. "I am the Way and the Truth." Wherefore if the Truth be sought by the human intellect, it must first of all submit it to Jesus Christ, and securely rest upon His teaching, since therein Truth itself speaketh. There are innumerable and extensive fields of thought, properly belonging to the human mind, in which it may have free scope for its investigations and speculations, and that not only agreeably to its nature, but even by a necessity of its nature. But what is unlawful and unnatural is that the human mind should refuse to be restricted within its proper limits, and throwing aside its becoming modesty, should refuse to acknowledge Christ's teaching. This teaching, upon which our salvation depends, is almost entirely about God and the things of God. No human wisdom has invented it, but the Son of God hath received and drunk it in entirely from His Father: "The words which thou gavest me, I have given to them" (John xvii., 8.) Hence this teaching necessarily embraces many subjects which are not indeed contrary to reason—for that would be an impossibility—but so exalted that we can no more attain them by our own reasoning than we can comprehend God as He is in Himself. If there be so many things hidden and veiled by nature which no human ingenuity can explain, and yet which no man in his senses can doubt, it would be an abuse of liberty to refuse to accept those which are entirely above nature, because their essence cannot be discovered. To reject dogma is simply to deny Christianity. Our intellect must bow humbly and reverently "unto the obedience of Christ," so that it be held captive by His divinity and authority: "bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ" (II. Corinthians x., 5.) Such obedience Christ requires, and justly so. For He is God, and as such holds supreme dominion over man's intellect as well as over his will. By obeying Christ with his intellect man by no means acts in a servile manner, but in complete accordance with his reason and his natural dignity. For by his will he yields not to the authority of any man, but to that of God, the author of his being, and the first principle to Whom he is subject by the very law of his nature. He does not suffer himself to be forced by the theories of any human teacher, but by the eternal and unchangeable truth. Hence he attains at one and the same time the natural good of the intellect and his own liberty. For the truth which proceeds from the teaching of Christ clearly demonstrates the real nature and value of every being; and man, being endowed with this knowledge, if he but obey the truth as perceived, will make all things subject to himself, not himself to them; his appetites to his reason, not his reason to his appetites. Thus the slavery of sin and falsehood will be shaken off, and the most perfect liberty attained: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John viii., 32). It is, then, evident that those whose intellect rejects the yoke of Christ are obstinately striving against God. Having shaken off God's authority, they are by no means freer, for they will fall beneath some human sway. They are sure to choose some one whom they will listen to, obey and follow as their guide. Moreover, they withdraw their intellect from the communication of divine truths, and thus limit it within a narrower circle of knowledge, so that they are less fitted to succeed in the pursuit even of natural science. For there are in nature very many things whose apprehension or explanation is greatly aided by the light of divine truth. Not unfrequently, too, God, in order to chastise their pride, does not permit men to see the truth, and thus they are punished in the things wherein they sin. This is why we often see men of great intellectual power and erudition making the grossest blunders even in natural science.

It must, therefore, be clearly admitted that in the life of a Christian the intellect must be entirely subject to God's authority. And if, in this submission of reason to authority our self-love, which is so strong, is restrained and made to suffer, this only proves the necessity to a Christian of long-suffering not only in will, but also in intellect. We would remind those persons of this truth who desire a kind of Christianity such as they themselves have devised, whose precepts should be very mild, much more indulgent towards human nature, and requiring little if any hardships to be borne. They do not properly understand the meaning of faith and Christian precepts. They do not see that the Cross meets us everywhere, the model of our life, the eternal standard of all who wish to follow Christ in reality and not merely in name.

God alone is Life. All other beings partake of life, but *are* not life. Christ from all eternity and by His very nature is "the Life," just as He is the Truth, because He is God of God. From Him, as from its most sacred source, all life pervades and ever will pervade creation. Whatever is, is by Him; whatever lives, lives by Him. For by the Word "all things were made; and without Him was made nothing that was made." This is true of the natural life; but, as We have sufficiently indicated above, we have a much higher and better life, won for us by Christ's mercy, that is to say, "the life of grace," whose happy consummation is "the life of glory," to which all our thoughts and actions ought to be directed. The whole object of Christian doctrine and morality is that "we being dead to sin, should live to justice" (I. Peter ii., 24)—that is, to virtue and holiness. In this consists the moral life, with the certain hope of a happy eternity. This justice, in order to be advantageous to salvation, is nourished by Christian faith. "The just man liveth by faith" (Galatians iii., 11). "Without faith it is impossible to please God" (Hebrews xi., 6). Consequently Jesus Christ, the creator and preserver of faith, also preserves and nourishes our moral life. This He does chiefly by the ministry of His Church. To her, in His wise and merciful counsel, He has entrusted certain agencies which engender the supernatural life, protect it, and revive it if it should fail. This generative and conservative power of the virtues that make for salvation is therefore lost whenever morality is dissociated from divine faith. A system of morality based exclusively on human reason robs man of his highest dignity and lowers him from the supernatural to the merely natural life. Not but that man is able by the right use of reason to know and to obey certain principles of the natural law. But though he should know them all and keep them inviolate through life—and even this is impossible without the aid of the grace of our Redeemer—still it in vain for any one without faith to promise hinself eternal salvation. "If any one abide not in Me, he shall be cast forth as a branch, and shall wither, and they shall gather him up and cast him into the fire, and he burneth" (John xv., 6). "He that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark xvi., 16). We have but too much evidence of the value and result of a morality divorced from divine faith. How is it that in spite of all the zeal for the welfare of the masses, nations are in such straits and even distress, and that the evil is daily on the increase? We are told that society is quite able to help itself; that it can flourish without the assistance of Christianity, and attain its end by its own unaided efforts. Public administrators prefer a purely secular system of government. All traces of the religion of our forefathers are daily disappearing from political life and administration. What blindness! Once the idea of the authority of God as the Judge of right and wrong is forgotten, law must necessarily lose its primary authority and justice must perish: and these are the two most powerful and most necessary bonds of society. Similarly, once the hope and expectation of eternal happiness is taken away, temporal goods will be greedily sought after. Every man will strive to secure the largest share for himself. Hence arise envy, jealousy, hatred. The consequences are conspiracy, anarchy, nihilism. There is neither peace abroad nor security at home. Public life is stained with crime.

So great is this struggle of the passions and so serious the dangers involved that we must either anticipate ultimate ruin or seek for an efficient remedy. It is, of course, both right and necessary to punish malefactors, to educate the masses, and by legislation to prevent crime in every possible way: but all this is by no means sufficient. The salvation of the nations must be looked for higher. A power greater than human must be called in to teach men's hearts, awaken in them the sense of duty and make them better. This is the power which once before saved the world from destruction when groaning under much more terrible evils. Once remove all impediments and allow the Christian spirit to revive and grow strong in a nation and that nation will be healed. The strife between the classes and the masses will die away; mutual rights will be respected. If Christ be listened to, both rich and poor will do their duty. The former will realize that they must observe justice and charity, the latter self-restraint and moderation, if both are to be saved. Domestic life will be firmly established by the salutary fear of God as the Lawgiver. In the same way the precepts of the natural law, which dictates respect for lawful authority and obedience to the laws, will exercise their influence over the people. Seditions and conspiracies will cease. Wherever Christianity rules over all without let or hindrance, there the order established by Divine Providence is preserved, and both security and prosperity are the happy result. The common welfare, then, urgently demands a return to Him from whom we should never have gone astray; to Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life—and this on the part not only of individuals, but of society as a whole. We must restore Christ to this His own rightful possession. All elements of the national life must be made to drink in the Life which proceedeth from Him—legislation, political institutions, education, marriage and family life, capital and labor. Every one must see that the very growth of civilization which is so ardently desired depends greatly upon this, since it is fed and grows not so much by material wealth and prosperity ,as by the spiritual qualities of morality and virtue.

It is rather ignorance than ill-will which keeps multitudes away from Jesus Christ. There are many who study humanity and the natural world; few who study the Son of God. The first step, then, is to substitute knowledge for ignorance, so that He may no longer be despised or rejected because He is unknown. We conjure all Christians throughout the world to strive all they can to know their Redeemer as He really is. The more one contemplates Him with sincere and unprejudiced mind, the clearer does it become that there can be nothing more salutary than His law, more divine than His teaching. In this work your influence, Venerable Brethren, and the zeal and earnestness of the entire clergy can do wonders. You must look upon it as a chief part of your duty to engrave upon the minds of your people the true knowledge, the very likeness of Jesus Christ; to illustrate His charity, His mercies, His teaching, by your writings and your words, in schools, in universities, from the pulpit; wherever opportunity is offered you. The world has heard enough of the so-called "rights of man." Let it hear something of the rights of God. That the time is suitable is proved by the very general revival of religious feeling already referred to, and especially that devotion towards Our Saviour of which there are so many indications, and which, please God, we shall hand on to the New Century as a pledge of happier times to come. But as this consummation cannot be hoped for except by the aid of divine grace, let us strive in prayer, with united heart and voice, to incline Almighty God unto mercy, that He would not suffer those to perish whom He had redeemed by His Blood. May He look down in mercy upon this world, which has indeed sinned much, but which has also suffered much in expiation! And embracing in His loving-kindness all races and classes of mankind, may He remember His own words: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to Myself" (John xii., 32).

As a pledge of the Divine favors and in token of Our fatherly affection, We lovingly impart to you, Venerable Brethren, and to your Clergy and People, the Apostolic Blessing.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome, the first day of November, 1900, in the twenty-third year of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII., Pope.

Scientific Chronicle.

FURNACE GASES.

The gases resulting from the combustion of fuel in blast furnaces have been turned to little practical use or have been entirely lost for commercial purposes. This loss has not been overlooked by practical men, and the question of the utilization of the discharge gases from blast furnaces has been under consideration for a long time. That they can be utilized has been settled in the affirmative, and now the search is for the best results in their utilization. On this point the article of Mr. F. W. Gordon in the *Iron Age,* showing their availability in the production of power according to the efficiency of the process is of interest.

From careful investigations Mr. Gordon considers, as a fair estimate, that 1,862 pounds of coke is burned per ton of pig iron. This is followed by a computation of what amount of heat is used by the furnace and what amount is available for other purposes. Judging of the completeness of the combustion from the composition of the discharge gases, it is fairly estimated that the total heat of the consumed gases would be 7,889.93 British thermal units. From this amount must be taken the loss in chimney gases, in radiation and connection from stoves and boilers, and the heat actually available would be 5,986.74 heat units, leaving an efficiency of about 75 per cent. Out of this amount to run the furnace, heat the blast, work the blowing engines, hoist the materials and pump water 2,220.94 units would be needed, thus leaving 3,765.8 units that could be employed in other ways.

This calculation has been made on the supposition that steam boilers are used as generators for the work done at the furnace. It must be remembered that steam engines have a maximum thermal efficiency of only 15 per cent. And if under such conditions there is such a residue from the gases for work in other ways, after the work at the furnace is done by them, we can judge of what can be done if these gases run combustion engines, such as gas engines, instead of steam. In gas engines, even for lease gas, the thermal efficiency can safely be taken at 30 per cent. against 15 per cent. in steam engines.

Mr. Gordon puts the matter in another light so as to impress upon the reader the value of the gases which up to the present have been allowed to escape from blast furnaces. In the case of a 300-ton blast furnace the power not required by the furnace and which would be available for other purposes amounts to 4,223.8 horse-power. The value of that power can easily be calculated. Supposing engines using 1.8 pounds of coal per horse-power hour, and that coal is worth $2.00 per ton, the value of the above power per annum would then be $61,095.

When furnace owners realize that by utilizing the gases from their furnaces their coal bill annually will be reduced sixty thousand dollars, we may expect a revolution in the operation of these mills. We shall find that gas-driven engines will provide the blast and work electric generators to provide power and light to all parts of the works; rolling mills will be worked by electricity, and after all this has been done there will be a surplus of energy in the gases which can be farmed out for outside purposes and which will yield a large profit. Hence improved methods will bring a larger profit and prevent the enormous waste of coal consequent upon the old ways.

The feasibility of employing electric motors will become more evident if an improvement lately suggested by Mr. Louis Katona, before the Iron and Steel Institute, be adopted. At present there is an immense waste of energy in rolling mills. The object of the mill is to reduce the cross section of the metal passing through it. It is therefore clear that the only part of the mill doing useful work at any given time is the particular groove through which the metal is passing. All the power required to drive the rest of the mill is wasted. Idle rolls, couplings, gearing and fly wheel are moved to accomplish nothing.

According to the suggest, long rolls with several passes would be done away with and instead there would be a separate pair of rolls for each groove, the rolls being shortened to mere disks. Such short rolls in pairs for forward and backward pass of the metal could easily be driven by electricity and the present great loss of power avoided, for one, two or more pairs could be worked at a time according to the demand.

With such a change in construction and the burning as a source of power of the gases from the blast furnace there would be a complete revolution for the better in the iron industry and a saving of coal. The manufacture of steel requires great purity in the fuel employed and a higher temperature than that obtained from the combustion of ordinary coal. Greater purity is obtained by removing from the coal all the impurities, leaving only almost pure carbon or coke. This is done in coke ovens. The phenomenal increase in the number of such ovens shows the demand for as pure carbon for a fuel as can be obtained. The greater heat is a necessary consequence of the employment of pure carbon in blast furnaces. Because instead of converting it into carbon monoxide it is completely burned to carbon dioxide. One kilogramme of carbon burned to carbon monoxide generates 2,442 calories, while the same amount burned to carbon dioxide yields 8,080 calories or heat units. Hence the complete combustion gives a higher efficiency. In coking the coal the liquid products are of great commercial value and the gases can be collected and utilized in ways already referred to. In at least one place these gases have been used for motive power. In Seraing, in Belgium, one motor of eight horse-power has been running successfully for some time and two others of twenty horse-power each are in course of construction. The gas from the coke furnace has a thermal efficiency of 4,500 calories per cubic metre or about 500 British thermal units per cubic foot. About 0.8 cubic metre is required per horse-power per hour. Here again we may point out the efficiency of gas engines. A battery of 25 coke ovens producing 40,000 cubic metres of gas in 24 hours would develop 520 horse-power if the gas were burned in a gas engine, while it would develop only 316 horse-power if burned under steam boilers. The pressure of modern competition is forcing the engineer to develop methods for utilizing waste wherever possible.

For condensing steam engines of 200 to 500 horse-power the coal consumption may be safely taken at 4 to 2.2 pounds per effective horse-power hour in actual working. For gas engines under the same conditions and using lean producer gas the fuel consumption is from 1.3 to 1.4 pounds of coal per horse-power hour. Taking the price of coal into account, there is a saving of 40 per cent. in the use of the gas engine. This is the case when the gas is manufactured for the purpose of working a gas engine. If the gas be furnished as a by product of the blast furnace or coke oven the great economy in the use of the gas engine is evident.

EXPORT OF AMERICAN COAL.

For a long time the possibility of American coal entering the English market has been discussed in the newspapers and industrial journals. It is now a fact. American coal has been furnished the London market, the purchaser being the South Metropolitan Gas Company. The consignment was small, but still it is the entering wedge. The question now discussed by those financially interested is whether our coal trade with England will continue and increase or not.

The answer to this question depends entirely on whether we can deliver in English markets our coal at a price to compete with English and Welsh prices in the same markets. In other words, can we sell our coal in England at a price that makes it worth while sending it to England?

Of late the prices have been high in England. This has been due to a combination of causes, but whether the rise is permanent or temporary is not yet clear. No doubt the war in South Africa influenced the rise in price. As a result of this war the South African mines were closed and there was a temporary increased demand at home to supply the transports and troopships. Apart from these causes, is there such an increase in export of coal in England as to indicate that our foreign market is enlarging?

The fact is that now the United States is the largest producer of coal in the world. This may be explained by an increased demand at home. But still it is in some measure due to an increased demand abroad, for while the export in coal has increased in England, still there has been a falling off in the amount used by steamers in the English foreign trade. This last is explained by the larger quantities of cheaper American coal to be had at foreign ports.

Not only do we produce more coal than England, but we can do so at a lower cost. This is due to two facts: First, in this country the coal is more accessible in the mines than in England; and, secondly, there is here a more general use of machinery. It is admitted that in this country we turn out 70 per cent. more coal per man in a year than they do in the British collieries.

While American steam coal as good as the best British can be delivered at our ports of shipment for less than one-half the price per ton, still the cost of transport brings the price of American coal higher in England than that of British coal. This objection to an English market for our coal may be overcome in two ways.

First, there is a claim that the American coal has a higher efficiency as a gas producer. It seems that this was the plea for the placing of the order to which we referred in the beginning. If it is found that the American coal is so much higher in efficiency, that its greater gas production will more than overbalance its higher price, it will be the cheaper in the end, and it is assured of a market in England.

Still, that this market amount to anything, the second difficulty must be met, and its successful solution means the supremacy of American coal in all foreign markets. A present freight of from three to four dollars a ton must be considerably reduced to make export coal business a success. To effect this there is at present a demand for a special class of collier. It must be a vessel of large carrying capacity, low cost of construction, sufficient engine power to steam about eight knots an hour, equipped with the best machinery for handling cargo, with minimum crew and hence minimum operating expense. This is evidently a vessel especially designed for the coal export trade.

Is such a vessel forthcoming? Shipowners, shipbuilders and coal operators in this country say it is. If so, it will undoubtedly do for the coal trade what the tank steamer has done and is doing for the petroleum trade. To encourage this project the railroads interested are uniting for a reduction in cost of carriage to the seaboard and for better terminal facilities. The Chesapeake and Ohio Coal Company, which controls the Newport News shipbuilding plant, proposes to construct a fleet of colliers, and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company is talking about doing the same thing. If these projects are carried to completion we may feel certain that our export of coal will be vastly increased.

Whether or not we succeed in selling a large amount of raw coal in England, it is certain that the placing of the American consumed product is rapidly increasing and is sure to be a permanent export. Every ton of pig iron exported represents the consumption of from two to two and a half tons of coal; and every ton of rolled iron and steel represents from six to eight tons of coal. But by virtue of proximity to the fuel and ore deposits, advanced methods of manufacture and low railroad rates to the seaboard, the United States is in a position to compete with European manufacturers of iron, in spite of the cost of ocean transport.

The coal question is one not only of individual comfort, but of industrial prosperity and national greatness. There is an ever-increasing burden put upon coal on account of the greater demand for iron and steel, for increased power, electric traction, electric lighting and higher steamship and railway speeds. These demands not only tend to raise the price of coal, but will also necessitate the development of our coal resources to meet this demand and impose more economic methods in the use of coal and develop new methods of utilizing the products resulting from the consumption of coal.

GASEOUS FUEL.

The use of solid fuel in certain branches of industry is attended with many inconveniences, among which is the great amount of waste and the consequent absence of cleanliness. This fact has been strongly emphasized wherever natural gas was found in sufficient quantities to be employed for fuel. Its almost immediate and still continued use proves that it is more satisfactory than solid fuel.

For metallurgical operations, on even a considerable scale gaseous fuel has been very successfully employed, especially in connection with reverberatory or open-hearth furnaces. The developments in the production of water gas lead to the expectation that there will be a wider application of gaseous fuel in the near future.

To produce gaseous fuel advantage is taken of the fact that carbon dioxide gas is changed to or reduced to carbon monoxide gas by passing the former over red-hot carbon. The *producer* in which this change is effected consists of a deep grate, into which fuel is fed from above, the air entering below the charge. The lower portion of the fuel burns to carbon dioxide, which is reduced to carbon monoxide by the hot carbon at the top of the producer. This gas, *producer gas* as it is called, when collected is not, of course, pure carbon monoxide. It contains the nitrogen of the air, some carbon dioxide and some products resulting from the destructive distillation of the coal. It has a calorific value of about 28,000 gram-units per cubic foot.

A gas more than double this in calorific value can be obtained from the original fuel by converting it into *water gas*. This conversion depends upon the fact that when steam is passed over heated carbon a mixture of hydrogen and carbon monoxide is obtained. In ordinary practice water gas is made by passing steam into a producer which is already at work until the temperature has so far fallen that the steam is no longer decomposed. The fuel is then again brought up to the proper temperature and the operation is repeated. While bringing the fuel to the required temperature by an air blast, producer gas is formed. Water gas is almost entirely made up of hydrogen and carbon monoxide, and hence is practically all combustible. Its calorific value is 74,000 gram-units per cubic foot. But only about 40 per cent. of the calorific value of the coke, which is usually employed in the process, appears in the resulting gas.

Two processes have been devised which give a higher efficiency. They are the Stache and the Dellwik-Fleischer. In the former the fuel employed is usually coal, or a mixture of coal and coke. During the blow the coal is coked. The producer gas resulting is carried to a regenerator and thus a portion of the heat which would otherwise have been lost is conserved. The producer gas in this process may be regarded as a by-product of the water gas generator. As the two gases are delivered separately they can be applied to appropriate uses.

The Dellwik-Fleischer system does not generate producer gas, but aims at burning the fuel completely to carbon dioxide, and this developes greater heat for the decomposition of the steam. That such is the case is clear from the fact that to burn one kilogramme of carbon to carbon monoxide generates 2,442 calories or heat-units, while burning it to carbon dioxide gives 8,080 calories. In this process a much less depth of fuel is used in the producer and the charge is introduced from the side so as to preserve this depth the more easily. The air pressure is also under control so as to secure the desired combustion. The efficiency of the water gas thus obtained is from 75 to 80 per cent. of the calorific value of the fuel used instead of only 40 per cent. in the case of producer gas. This makes water gas available commercially as a fuel, where before its cost was prohibitive. Some of its advantages may be gathered from a comparison of solid and gaseous fuels for furnace use in manufacturing.

In the case of solid fuel care must be taken of the shape of the furnace and of the manner of firing it, so that the carbon monoxide be formed at the proper point and the desired reducing effect obtained. This result depends on a number of factors, such as the height of column of charge, shape and area of tuyeres, volume and pressure of the blast and manner of charging the ore. Again, where solid fuel is mixed with the charge throughout the furnace an irregularity in the blast or in the arrangement of the materials in the furnace may cause the combustion to creep upwards, burning the fuel not only at a useless point, but at one that is absolutely prejudicial. The presence of sulphur in the present methods with solid fuel is also detrimental.

With the use of water gas these difficulties seem to be obviated. The necessity of regulating the point at which the carbon monoxide is formed is done away with, for the gas is produced outside the furnace and the whole question is the simple controlling of the amount of gas and air admitted. The gas can be burned just where it is required, and the fusion zone confined to desired limits. Hence the possibility of the fire creeping up irregularly through the charge is avoided. The gas is, moreover, a clean fuel and is easily purified from sulphur and its freedom from ash is a benefit in all kinds of smelting.

NOTES.

The Mosquito and Malaria.—The experiment made by Drs. Sambon and Low and referred to in our last "Chronicle," according to published accounts, appears to have been successful. The doctors and their associates, who have been living in a mosquito-proof hut in the Roman Campagna, drinking the water, exposed to the damp night air and taking no quinine, have so far been free from malaria. On the other hand, Mr. P. Thurburn Mason ,who allowed himself to be bitten every second day by infected mosquitoes, fed in Rome, on those suffering from malarial fever, has suffered an attack of fever and what are known as tertian parasites were found in his blood.

In this connection the report of Drs. Reed, Carroll, Agramonte and Lazear, who were appointed last summer by the Surgeon-General to investigate infectious diseases in Cuba, is of interest. It appears, from their report, that in eleven cases in which non-immune individuals were inoculated through the bites of mosquitoes, two attacks of yellow fever followed, and a third attack, which ended in the death of Dr. Lazear, seems directly traceable to the bite of a contaminated mosquito. They think that renewed interest must be excited in the mosquito-theory of the propagation of yellow fever, first proposed by Dr. Finlay, since they have found a typical case of yellow fever, which followed the bite of an infected mosquito, within the usual period of incubation of the disease and under circumstances in which other sources of infection can be excluded.

Molten Wood.—Consul-General Hananer, of Frankfort, reports that M. DeGall, inspector of forests at Lemur, France, has succeeded in melting wood. It is done by means of dry distillation and high pressure. The escape of resulting gases is prevented, and thereby the wood is brought to a molten condition. When cooled it assumes the character of coal, but the organic structure of that mineral is absent. The resulting body is hard, but can be easily shaped and polished. It is impervious to water and acids and is a perfect electrical non-conductor.

Petroleum or Calcium Carbide.—Germany pays the United States annually the sum of twenty-five millions of dollars for petroleum used for the purposes of light and heat. Will this industry with Germany continue? According to the report of the British Consul at Stuttgart, there are at least 200,000 jets of acetylene gas in use in Germany. Thirty-two small towns, with populations up to 5,000, are lighted by acetylene, as well as railway carriages on the German Government lines. The amount of carbide consumed in Germany during the year 1900 reaches 17,000 tons. This is equal in illuminating power to about 7,000,000 gallons of petroleum. Still further preparations are making for the introduction of acetylene as an illuminant, and German capital is invested at home and abroad in the manufacture of the carbide. It is admitted that the petroleum industry is encroached upon most by the use of acetylene. Other American industries, such as petroleum implements, novelty lamps and oil stoves, will be effected by this change in illumination in Germany.

Wireless Telegraphy.—Much activity is still shown in wireless telegraphy experiments. We learn that Mr. Arthur Gray, in the employ of Mr. Marconi, has arrived at Honolulu, with the intention of putting the wireless telegraph system into operation between the Hawaiian Islauds. He has the latest appliances of the Marconi system and is sanguine that it will work successfully. At the same time the news comes that the General Post Office in England is going to purchase the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy. While this report is not confirmed, it is known that a special commission of the Postal Department is preparing to report on the question of its adoption. If the Government takes over the system, it remains to be seen whether it does so merely as a governmental safeguard or with a view of revolutionizing telegraphy. Another point in favor of the wireless system is the fact that Rear Admiral Bradford, Chief of the Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department, recommends the installation of wireless telegraph outfits on all our ships of the navy. A special board had been appointed to watch the working of the system at the yacht races last year and their report was favorable. It is regarded as a practical system of communicating between the ships and between ships and shore stations.

The French War Department has decided to devote $80,000 to secret experiments in wireless telegraphy, with a view to improving its campaign applications.

A New Welding Process.—This process is the invention of Dr. Goldschmidt, of Essen. The heat required is obtained by means of a new compound which is called "Thermit." It consists of a mixture of metallic oxides with aluminium. Its utility consists in the fact that it permits of a quick and simple production of a fusible mass at high temperatures. By its use rails may be welded at any desired place, and all that is needed is a simple melting-pot. The procedure is thus given: The melting-pot is filled with tar oil to which an inflammable mixture is added. A match serves to ignite it. Small quanties of Thermit are then added, which immediately ignites and a temperature as high as 3,000 C is reached. The incandescent contents of the pot consist of iron, on the top of which floats melted carborundum. An aluminum oxide is then poured on the part of the rail to be welded, and the work is done so rapidly that the melting-pot can be taken in the hand as soon as it is emptied.

Electricity in the Chemical Arts.—The part that electricity plays in the industries that depend upon the forming and dissolving of chemical compounds is hardly realized by the general reader. Soap-making and paper-making have been largely influenced by the electrolytic manufacture of caustic soda. Calcium carbide, a product of the electric furnace, has given rise to the new acetylene industry. In Italy and Switzerland it is claimed that iron is reduced as a commercial article by the agency of the electric current. A whole new family of substances has been discovered lately, the product of the electric furnace. The members are the cilicides of calcium, barium, stroutium and of other alkaline metals. The process of manufacture is so cheap that it is thought that the first member of this family will assume an important position in the industrial world. One of its chief characteristics is that when immersed in water it brings about the evolution of a large quantity of hydrogen. The dyeing industry may profit by the great reducing action of these substances. Electrolytic copper is now a permanent article in the market. We owe aluminium as a commercial article to electricity. Add to this list many of the more expensive drugs which are prepared by electrolytic processes and we can form some idea of the important part electricity plays in the chemical arts.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

Some Notes on the Bibliography of the Philippines. By *Rev. Thomas Cooke Middleton, D. D., O. S. A.* Being Bulletin Number 4 of the Free Library of Philadelphia. Large 8vo, pp. 58, in covers.

All eyes are now turned towards Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines. Students are eager to learn the truth about them. So many conflicting statements have been made in regard to them that it is not easy to tell truth from falsehood. This is more true in regard to the Philippines because they are so far away that very few persons make the journey to them. Even these generally return after a short stay to contradict one another about the country and its inhabitants. The difficulties in the way of the stranger in the Philippines are many, but they do not excuse ignorant, hasty or misleading statements. The people are strange to us, with their peculiarities of origin, tradition, language, dress and custom; and all this should make the writer and speaker from foreign countries more cautious in his statements.

One of the commonest errors in regard to them is the belief that they are ignorant. This is an evil that is very big in American eyes, with its widespread system of public schools. An American will forgive almost anything else before ignorance of book knowledge. He sums up all virtues in secular education, which without moral training is a questionable virtue, indeed.

As the title of Father Middleton's paper shows this accusation against the Philippines is not true. They have a bibliography and an Augustinian priest in America makes this truth known.

A *short* catalogue of Philippine literature, prepared by the bibliographer, W. E. Retama, comprises as many as three thousand separate works. This statement will probably surprise many of the learned who have been weeping over the ignorance of the poor Philippinos and preparing to carry the light of modern civilization to them.

The Philoblblon Club of Philadelphia invited Rev. Thomas C. Middleton, O. S. A., to read a paper before its members on this subject. It was so instructive that its publication was called for. The manuscript was entrusted to one of our newspapers and was lost. In answer to earnest requests from members of the Philobiblon Club, Dr. Middleton rewrote it, but it was destroyed in the Lippincott fire. Again the learned and indefatigable author took up his pen and we have the result of his labor before us, printed by the Free Library of Philadelphia for the use of the students and patrons of the library.

"Our list of Philippina," says our author, "although given merely in outline embraces in its sweep across the literary horizon of that quarter of Malaysia, many works of recognized merit in the several lines of intellectual energy—of history, archæology, ethnology, philology and natural philosophy."

The purpose of the author is stated in these words: "To point out those sources of information anent the Philippine Islands wherein the scholar can best find a general description or history of them, the most trustworthy works on their very varied and multiform languages, as well as other topics cognate with these. Hence these sub-sections into which my paper is split: (1) Works of General Information; (2) Authorities on Philippine Dialects; (3) Some Literary Curios among Philippina; (4) Philippine Presses; (5) Introduction of Printing into the Philippines."

In the development of his subject under these heads Dr. Middleton brings forward a fund of useful information in that clear-cut, concise manner peculiar to the best historians who set fact not fancy before their readers. He deserves a vote of thanks from the public in general, and he will get it from all lovers of truth. He closes with these very striking words about the introduction of printing into the Philippines:

"With no originals at hand, we feel disinclined to pursue this topic further as to the priority of printing in the islands, nor do we care to press the question whether, namely, the first book of Philippine manufacture was Bugarin's dictionary of 1630, Blancas' *Arte* of 1610, or the Lubao *Tratadillos* of 1606.

"In our own colonies (we may observe) printing was introduced, first at Cambridge, in Massachusetts, in 1638; while in Pennsylvania the first book printed—an almanac—by William Bradford, of Philadelphia, is dated 1685, a full half century later, that is, than the introduction of this 'art preservative of arts' into Malaysia."

—

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE AT THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES. By *Johannes Janssen*. Translated by A. M. Christie. Vols. III. and IV. Herder, 17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.

We possess in these two volumes, an English translation of the second volume of Janssen's great history, the most important of the entire series, since it contains his masterly exposition of the rise and spread of the Lutheran heresy. It is needless to enter upon a eulogy of Janssen's history; the whole Catholic world is unanimous in pronouncing that he has spoken the last word on the subject of German Protestantism in all its phases; and the Protestant world has paid him the homage of bitter and unreasoning hatred. Under his well-directed blows the repulsive idol of Saxony lies shattered beyond hope of restoration. The influence of Janssen's work is visible on the pages even of non-Catholic writers; and few there are who still retain the courage to place a halo about the head of the ex-monk of Wittenberg.

Mr. Herder has spared no pains to bring out the books with the beauty and elegance that are characteristic of whatever proceeds from his press.

We cannot, however, say that he has been extremely happy in his choice of a translator. We realize, indeed, that the rendition of a work so erudite and scientific as Janssen's history is no easy task. All the more necessary is it, therefore, that the translation should be carefully overlooked by competent persons. There are many in the country who are able to do this work of revision; we ourselves would be only too glad to give our services gratuitously if called upon. We have gone over the first of these volumes, carefully comparing the translation with the original, and have been obliged to use our blue pencil all too frequently. Some of the translator's mistakes betray a defective acquaintance with the German idiom; others of them evince a sad lack of historical knowledge.

Not wishing to be hypercritical, we shall pass over numerous minor blunders: one blunder, however, we are compelled to denounce in the strongest terms. As every child knows, it has been, during the last four centuries, contended by Protestants, and strenuously denied by Catholics, that the Church in Luther's time openly *sold* indulgences. To our utter amazement, we find this stated, clearly and repeatedly, not by Janssen, but by his bungling translator. On page 78 of Vol. III. we read: "Julius II. had proclaimed a *sale of indulgences* for laying the foundations of the new St. Peter's Church. Leo X. renewed the *sale* in 1514, in order to raise money for the completion of the building, and employed the Minorites to proclaim the Bulls relating to the *sale*." Need we tell the reader that Janssen says nothing of the kind? "Julius II.," he informs us, "had proclaimed an indulgence (hatte einen Ablass ausgeschrieben). Leo X. renewed the same (erneuerte deuselben) and entrusted to the Franciscans the proclamation of the bulls concerning it (und übertrug den Minoriten die Verkündigung der betreffenden Bullen.") Where is there in this passage the remotest allusion to a *sale* of indulgences? Is this Christie a crypto-Protestant, endeavoring to stultify the great champion of the Catholic religion? With painful reiteration the objectionable phrase recurs page after page.

We can only repeat what we said when we had read the first two volumes of this "translation," that Mr. Herder has been unfortunate in his translator and deserved a better fate. This is all the more to be deplored since the publisher has done all that in him lay to perform his part of the work with care and diligence.

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791. The original French, Latin and Italian texts, with English translations and notes; illustrated by portraits, maps and facsimiles. Edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites. Vol LXX. All Missions, 1747-1764. 8vo, pp. 318. Cleveland: The Burroughs Bros. Co.

This grand historical achievement is practically completed. The text will be finished in Vol. 71, and the analytical index will fill volumes 72 and 73.

When the publishers made their preliminary announcement many persons must have doubted their ability to carry the project to a successful conclusion. The task which they set for themselves was not an easy one. It was beset with many difficulties, and shrewd bookmen shook their heads doubtingly. Had not these Jesuits Relations been in existence for periods reaching back nearly three hundred years? Had they not been published singly at different times? What interest could they have for any one except a collector, who would pay a high price for them at auction from time to time? Could a sufficient number of persons be found who would give the high figure required to bring out a complete set of the Relations, in an edition limited to 750 copies, with all the original documents printed in French, Latin and Italian, together with the English translation, and printed on sumptuous paper with illustrations? These and similar questions were asked with that peculiar intonation of voice which indicates that only one answer is possible, and it must be spelled with two letters. But the result has justified the foresight of the enterprising publishers. Now, on the eve of completion, we are informed that the work is expected to go out of print in the near future. Only a few sets remain for sale, and these will be quickly bought, because some cautious book lovers will not purchase so important a work until it is nearly or quite completed. It is not likely that it will be reprinted for many years, if ever. The Relations are accessible in their entirety only in the present form, and since the publication of this edition was begun, some of the originals have been destroyed.

Those who wish to possess it should take advantage of this opportunity, because copies will rarely appear in the market in the future, and when they do, will command high prices.

In the volume before us Poitier's account book of the Huron mission at Detroit, which was begun in Vol. 69, is finished. Then follows the official catalogue of the Jesuit order for 1756, in which are named the persons then employed in its North American missions. An unnamed "missionary to the Abnakis" (but known to be Pierre

Roubaud) contributes to *Lettres édifiantes* an account of the capture of Fort William Henry (or George.) The next chapter gives a brief outline, by Etienne de Villeneuve, written in 1762, of the history of the Huron nation and the missions established among them. The suppression in France of the Jesuit order (1761-62) led to similar proceedings elsewhere; and the superior council of Louisiana, by a decree dated July 9, 1763, expelled the Jesuits from that colony. In this volume an account is given of that event and its consequences by one of the exiled fathers. The work is intensely interesting, and at times fascinating. There is a rich mine here for the true Christian novelist.

LIFE OF SISTER MARY GONZAGA GRACE, of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, 1812-1897. By *Eleanor C. Donnelly.* 12mo, illustrated, pp. 334. Philadelphia: St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum, Seventh and Spruce streets.

Sister Mary Gonzaga was born in the year 1812; her father died in 1814; her mother died in 1816; she was adopted by Miss Elizabeth Michel, aged 17, a friend of her mother; she was received as a Sister of Charity in 1827; she was sent to Harrisburg in 1828, and to St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum for Girls in Philadelphia in 1830. At that time the Home was on Sixth street, near Holy Trinity Church. In 1832 she nursed the cholera-stricken patients of Philadelphia during the terrible scourge of that year. She and her companions offered their services to the city authorities, and discharged their duty so faithfully as to merit public approval when the scourge had passed.

In 1836 St. Joseph's Asylum was moved to the present site at Seventh and Spruce streets, and in 1843 Sister Mary Gonzaga was made superior. In the following year she and her companion Sisters, with their orphan charges, passed through the reign of terror called the Know-Nothing Riots of 1844, which have left a stain on the history of Philadelphia that cannot be blotted out.

During the War of the Rebellion she presided over the hospital in Camp Satterlee, on the western bank of the Schuylkill river, where thousands of wounded soldiers from the North and South, and of all creeds, were tenderly nursed by the daughters of St. Vincent under her direction. Many of them live to the present day to bless her memory.

After that stormy period had passed she retired again to the quiet walls of St. Joseph's Asylum, to labor faithfullly and perseveringly, until the Bridegroom called her on October 8, 1897.

Her body was followed to St. Mary's Church by a great crowd of sorrowing friends and admirers, who wept tears of genuine grief because she whom they loved had been taken from them. She was laid to rest in the churchyard, but her monument was built in Germantown. It is not a tablet of shining marble nor a shaft of enduring granite, but it is brighter and more lasting than brass or stone. It was most fitting that she who had devoted her whole life to the orphans should continue to protect them after her death. This was made possible by the erection of the Gonzaga Memorial House in Germantown, where the orphan shall find a home under her name.

Miss Donnelly has told the story beautifully. No one could be found better fitted for the work. It was a labor of love for her. Her well-known literary ability, her strong faith, her intimate association with Mother Gonzaga and St. Joseph's Asylum for so many years—all gave to her an equipment which could not be found in any one else. Hence the story of a good life well told.

HISTORY OF AMERICA BEFORE COLUMBUS, According to Documents and Approved Authors. By *P. De Roo.* Two volumes, 8vo, pp. l., 613, and xxiii., 612, with maps. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

The origin of this very important contribution to the history of America is told by the reverend author in these words:

"For several years I searched the Vatican Secret Archives to obtain reliable information regarding the history of one of the Roman Pontiffs, Alexander VI., who is as much slandered as he is little known. While garnering from the richest of historical treasuries the most important notes of my study, I happened, once in a great while, to meet with some original and unpublished record pertaining to the religious history of America, either of the time of the Spanish discovery or before it. No wonder if I, an American, considered those documents highly valuable and copied them carefully."

This was the beginning. He soon began to search other libraries and consult other authors to complete the history of the period. He traced the signs of Christianity, which he found in America shortly before the time of Columbus, back to the earliest periods, and then retraced his steps, adding to the evidence already in hand and increasing it at every stage. In this way the story grew, until it arrived at the ample proportions of the two volumes which we see before us.

While the author did not intend to write a history of religion in America before Columbus, the nature of the documents which formed the foundation of the work, gives a religious complexion to it. We must not conclude, however, that the social, civil and political history of the period has been neglected.

The first volume deals with the American Aborigines, while the second treats of European Immigrants. A striking feature of the first volume is a list of all the manuscripts and printed literature consulted, with the names of all the authors quoted. The number is very large. A remarkable feature of the second volume is the series of Catholic bishops on American territory before Columbus. In both volumes, at the end, copious quotations are made from original documents.

Altogether, Father DeRoo has made a very valuable contribution to American history, and incidentally to the history of Christianity in America. The work entailed enormous labor, while requiring great ability, and the learned author was in every way equal to the task. His book will live as a monument to his learning and zeal.

The publishers have shown a keen appreciation of the value of the work by putting it into splendid form. Indeed, it could not be better done. They inform us that the issue is limited to fifteen hundred copies printed from type. We shall not be surprised to learn in the near future that it has gone out of print. Those who desire to possess it should procure it at once.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST: an Argument. Translated from the French of Mgr. Emile Bougaud by C. L. Currie. 12mo, pp. viii., 159. New York: William H. Young & Co.

In this small volume we have a brief statement of the second volume of Mgr. Bougaud's famous Christian Apology. The original work, written in French, embraced five volumes and appeared in 1874. The author's purpose was to explain Christianity rather than to prove it, because he believed that the number of those who were ignorant of it was far greater than the number of those who were opposed to it. He wrote especially for the present age, and endeavored to show Christianity to the world under a form that would first attract its attention and then win its assent. He was unusually well equipped for such a task. He knew his age well. His learning, piety, oratory and zeal all stamped him as preëminently the man for the work. He noticed that we live in an age when men are very practical—an age of observation, when material things absorb most attention. In order to draw the attention of the world to Christ, instead of speaking to it of His Divinity first and then of His Humanity, which was the method pursued formerly, he invited this practical age to consider the beautiful Humanity of Christ first, and then turn to His divinity. He was encouraged to pursue this course because the Master Himself followed it with doubting Thomas. It succeeded beyond the author's fondest hopes.

Some time after the publication of the original work, Mgr. Bougaud brought the five volumes to Pope Leo XIII. to present them to him. The Pope said to him: "My dear son, I have your work in my library for a long while, and I have annotated every page with my own hand." It is most fitting then that the work of such an author on the Divinity of Christ should be placed before the English-speaking world, side by side with the Encyclical of the Holy Father on the same subject, at the dawn of the twentieth century, which we are invited to give to the God-Man. Read together, they will surely draw many hearts to that great heart which burst with love for them.

DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by James Hastings, M. A., D. D. Large 8vo. Vol. III. Kir-Pleiades. Pp. 896. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

This very important work is nearing completion. The present volume covers three-fourths of the proposed field, and the last volume is promised for next year. It is coming from the press at a very opportune time. The interest in Biblical study was never more general nor the advance in kindred sciences more rapid. A book of this kind must be very well done indeed to merit confidence. The time has passed when a brief summary of some parts of the subject and vague allusions to other parts will satisfy the student. The Bible is so commonly known, we had almost written "well known," that all its claims are scrutinized and questioned. It is so widely discussed that the youngest student challenges its most sacred sentences with as much impudence and irreverence as if they were the utterances of the most ignorant man and not the words of the wisest God. In such an age he must be learned indeed who will teach anything about the Great Book.

The projectors of this Bible Dictionary seemed to have understood this well, for they planned carefully. As to fulness, as to reliability, as to accessibility, the work leaves nothing to be desired, with this qualification, which we have made before and which we must repeat, that no Catholic writer is a member of the editorial staff. This is a serious defect in a work of the kind for Catholics. Many subjects should have been treated by Catholics only; on other subjects the articles should have been revised by Catholics. An illustration of the truth of this assertion may be found in the article on the Blessed Virgin. If the writer had confined himself to the history of the subject, his work would have been incomplete, but not offensive. This is one example: there are many others, for the book embraces the theology of the Bible.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By *Rev. Francis E. Gigot, S. S.*, Professor of Sacred Scripture in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md. 8vo, pp. 606. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This volume is to be followed by two others; one on "Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament," and the other on "Special Introduction to the New Testament." The author tells us that they are the outcome of lectures on these subjects delivered during several years in St. John's Ecclesiastical Seminary, Boston, and that they are intended chiefly for the use of similar institutions as text-books. So far as we know this is the first time that so complete a course has been prepared in English, and it will be heartily welcomed by the advocates of text-books in the vernacular for our seminaries. Such a book was badly needed. Latin works on the same subject were too profuse for the average seminary course, and English works were too brief. In the present instance the reverend author has found the happy medium. Only a man of his experience and ability could have hoped to succeed. The combination of the two qualities was required. To be able to cover the whole ground in a sufficiently brief manner, and to give to each part its necessary amount of attention, without being obscure, was no easy task. But our author has succeeded. At the same time he has preserved the usefulness of a larger work, to a great extent at least, by numerous references which will enable the more ambitious student to pursue the subject farther.

Additional value attaches to the book because it is up to date. This is a very important characteristic of such a work, and it is shown especially in the appendix which treats of Inspiration. The photographic reproductions of ancient manuscripts is a unique feature. Altogether the book is a very important addition to Catholic Biblical literature, and one that will surely be appreciated.

Stonyhurst Philosophical Series—PSYCHOLOGY: Empirical and Rational. By *Michael Maher, S. J.*, Professor of Mental Philosophy at Stonyhurst College. Fourth Edition, rewritten and enlarged. 12mo, pp. xxviii., 602. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The first edition of Father Maher's book appeared in 1890, and it won the highest praise from all critics. So great was its success that the author made only a few verbal changes in the second and third editions. When, however, he began to prepare the present edition, he found that such a large quantity of fresh psychological literature had appeared, especially in America, and he was compelled to make so many additions and alterations that the book has assumed the proportions of a new work. He states his purpose so well that we prefer to let him speak for himself:

"My aim here, as in previous editions, has been not to construct a new original system of my own, but to resuscitate and make better known to English readers a Psychology that has already survived four and twenty centuries, that has had more influence on human thought and human language than all other psychologies together, and that still commands a far larger number of adherents than any rival doctrine. My desire, however, has been not merely to expound, but to expand this old system; not merely to defend its assured truths, but to test its principles, to develop them, to apply them to the solution of modern problems, and to reinterpret its generalizations in the light of the most recent researches. I have striven to make clear to the student of modern thought that this ancient psychology is not quite so absurd, nor these old thinkers quite so foolish, as the current caricatures of their teaching would lead one to imagine; and I believe I have shown that not a little of what is supposed to be new has been anticipated, and that most of what is true can be assimilated without much difficulty by the old system. On the other hand, I have sought to bring the scholastic student into closer contact with modern questions, and to acquaint him better with some of the merits of modern psychological analysis and explanation."

The work is purely philosophical, and not only every Christian, but every Theist should assent to all that it contains. The first institution to adopt it as a text book, after Stonyhurst College, was a Protestant Theological College in England.

Father Maher has so arranged his text, with different type and different headings, as to make it easier for various classes of readers. He gives the key to this arrangement in the beginning under the title, "Hints on Judicious Skipping." Altogether it is really a wonderful book. Although dealing with a subject that is beset with difficulties for both teacher and student, he has succeeded in making an interesting, clear, concise, yet comprehensive manual.

It will be useful to all English speaking students, but it should be especially acceptable to Americans, who are devoting so much attention to the subject, and particularly in its bearing on education. Certainly every Catholic student who is asked to study psychology should do so with this book at hand.

THE HOLY YEAR OF JUBILEE. An account of the History and Ceremonial of the Roman Jubilee. By *Herbert Thurston, S. J.* Illustrated from Contemporary Engravings and other sources. 8vo, pp. xxiv., 420. St. Louis: Herder.

Here is a very fitting memorial of the Holy Year 1900 and its Jubilee. It is an exhaustive treatise on the subject, tracing its history back to its beginning. The author tells us that he did not intend to publish so comprehensive a history of the Roman Jubilee, but rather a briefer treatise or compilation from well-known authorities. He soon found, however, that the difficulties in the way of a writer who would adapt the language of older jubilee manuals for modern readers were so many and so great that he was forced to permit his book to grow in scope until it has become, practically, an original work. No one will regret the combination of circumstances that brought about such a result, for now we have a work on the subject that is comprehensive and in every way satisfactory.

The book is not controversial at all, and in only one instance does the writer depart from generally accepted authorities. Historians of every school, from Bonanni and Zaccaria to Gregorovius, have agreed in attributing the introduction of the Holy Door ceremonial to Alexander VI. The evidence now for the first time brought together shows that this view is untenable.

Notwithstanding his desire to avoid controversy, the author thought it important to enter a protest against the serious misunderstanding of the phrase *a pœna et culpa.* Two chapters are devoted to the subject. Although the book is historical, it seemed desirable for the sake of completeness to give some account of the practical aspects of the Jubilee.

The illustrations are generally very quaint, but we must remember that they are taken in some instances from very old pictures in the British Museum, and that they are used because of their historical accuracy.

Father Thurston, in his usual able manner, has produced one of the books of the year. One worthy to act as a link between the last year of the nineteenth century and the first year of the twentieth.

ORESTES A. BROWNSON'S LATTER LIFE: from 1856 to 1876. By *Henry F. Brownson.* 8vo, pp. 629. Detroit: H. F. Brownson.

With this volume Mr. Henry F. Brownson finishes the biography of his illustrious father. He was a man who would have stamped his personality on any age. His great mind was not confined to any one art or science, but seemed to include the whole field of knowledge. Philosophy, theology, sociology, politics—all acknowledged him a master. With his great power and splendid equipment he was fearless to a fault and honest beyond question. The life of such a man should be told fully and well. He is worthy of a biographer as great as himself. But intellectual giants are almost as rare as physical ones.

It is fortunate that Mr. Henry F. Brownson took up this work. With the wealth of material at hand, his great sympathy for the subject, and his ability, it has been well done. It forms a very important contribution to American history and particularly to American Catholic history.

D. DIONYSII CARTUSIANI OPERA OMNIA. Tomus X. In Danielem, et XII., Prophetas Minores. Monstrolii, Typis Cartusiæ Sanctæ Mariæ de Pratis, MDCCCC.

The tenth volume of this admirable edition of a most valuable work leaves nothing to be desired when compared with its predecessors. Beautifully printed, clear and legible, and on good paper, it is worthy of its mission. The old charge, so often refuted, that the Church is opposed to the free study of the Holy Scriptures, is most effectually answered by the very existence of these fifteen large volumes devoted entirely to the elucidation of the written word of God. A work of this kind, undertaken in the thirteenth century, when, if we may believe some historians, the darkest night were bright as compared to the ignorance that prevailed—undertaken, too, by a monk—stands as a continual reproach to the adversaries of the Church, a monument to the industry and devotion of a class so freely maligned as the monks. Moreover, it should be noted that study sanctified by prayer, as in the case of Dionysius, leads not to the Higher Criticism, so-called, but to a firmer and more reverent acceptance of God's Word in its entirety.

Those who may intend subscribing should do so at an early date. After March 1 the price will be raised from eight to fifteen francs per volume.

HISTORICAL MEMOIRS OF THE CITY OF ARMAGH. By *James Stuart*. New edition revised, corected and largely rewritten by Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O. P., S. T. L. Large 8vo, pp. xxiv., 477. Illustrated. Dublin: Brown & Nolan—M. H. Gill & Son.

This notable book first saw the light in 1819. It had been out of print for many years when the present incumbent of the See of Armagh, His Eminence Cardinal Logue, resolved to have it reëdited and reprinted in connection with the great bazaar which had been organized for the benefit of his Cathedral. It was always an important historical work, but in its new form it is really invaluable. At the time when it was first written historical research in that particular field was in its infancy. Since then such rapid progress has been made that instead of a new edition of an old book, we have a new book. Moreover, Mr. Stuart was not a Catholic; he wrote for Protestants principally, and his work could not be acceptable to the Catholic public without many modifications. With this thought in mind, the present work has been done. The author wisely leaves that part of the book untouched which treats of Protestant Primates, except in some minor details of arrangement. For the rest we have practically a new book.

And a very charming book it is, taking us back to the time when St. Patrick built the city and established his see in it, and introducing us to the long line of illustrious men that followed in hs footsteps.

It is beautifully made.The type, the paper, the illustrations, all are worthy of the subject. The demand for it should be large.

THE LAST YEARS OF ST. PAUL. By the *Abbe Constant Fouard*. Translated by George F. X. Griffith. 12mo, pp. xiii., 326. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

When the Abbé Fouard finished his work on St. Paul and his Missions he promised another volume which would bring the life of the great Apostle of the Gentiles to a close. Here it is, gotten up in the same form as the preceding volume, and closing the series of manuals of early Church history on which the author has been engaged for several years. He has had great difficulties to contend with in the present work, because he had to construct a history without historical facts. From the epistles of James, and Jude, and Peter, and the later epistles of Paul himself, slight facts must be gleaned, for they are the only sources available for the student of this period of the Church's infancy.

Rationalistic critics attack even these few documents and try to destroy their authenticity. It is worthy of note, however, that their attacks are weakening. The Christian student is not moved by the sneering objections of the rationalistic school, for he knows that time will vindicate his confidence in the precious documents of the Sacred Scriptures. The pleasure that one experiences when he hears the announcement of the beginning of a good book is very much increased when he hears that it is finished. Such pleasure is ours with Abbé Fouard's last volume before us.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Brain in Relation to Mind. By *J. Sanderson Christison, M. D.*, author of "Crime and Criminals," etc. 12mo, pp. 143. Chicago: The Meng Publishing Co.

Cithara Mea. Poems by *Rev. P. A. Sheehan*, author of "My New Curate." 12mo, pp. 246. Boston: Marlier, Callanan & Co.

Transactions of the Canadian Institute. Vol VI. Semi-Centennial Colonial volume, 1849-1899. Large 8vo, pp. 660. Toronto: Canadian Institute.

The City for the People; or, the Municipalization of the City Governm and of Local Franchises. By *Frank Parsons.* 8vo, pp. 597. Philadelphia: C. F. Taylor, 1520 Chestnut street.

An Epitome of the New Testament in Greek. By *Rev. Nicholas J. Stoffel, C. S. C.*, Professor of Greek in the University of Notre Dame. 12mo, pp. 322. Notre Dame University.

Apologetik, als Spekulative Grundlegung der Theologie. Von *Dr. Al. V. Schmid*, ö Professor der Apologetik an der Universität München. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder; 1900. Price, $1.60.

The Way of the World and Other Ways. By *Katherine E. Conway.* Boston: Pilot Publishing Co., 1900.

Around the Crib. By *Abbé Henry Perreyve.* New York: W. H. Young & Co., 1900.

A Day in the Cloister. Adapted from the German of Dom Sebastian Von Oer, O. S. B., by Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B. 12mo, pp. xv., 291. St. Louis: B. Herder.

At the Feet of Jesus. By *Madame Cecilia*, Religious of St. Andrew's Convent. 12mo, pp. x., 279. London: Burns & Oates.

Death Jewels. By *Percy Fitzgerald.* London: Burns & Oates.

The Spiritual Life and Prayer, according to Holy Scripture and Monastic

Tradition. Translated from the French by the Benedictines of Stanbrook. 12mo, pp. xxi., 434. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE BEAUTY OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA (Religious Meditations). By the *Rev. Jules Souben*, Professor at the Benedictine Priory, Farnborough. 12mo, pp. vi., 247. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE LIFE OF OUR LORD, written for Little Ones. By *Mother Mary Salome*, of the Bar Convent, York. 12mo, pp. vi., 430. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LIVES OF THE SAINTS, for children. By *Th. Berthold.* With twelve illustrations. 16mo, pp. 175. New York: Benziger Brothers.

A TROUBLED HEART AND HOW IT WAS COMFORTED AT LAST. By *Charles Warren Stoddard.* 16mo, pp. 192. Notre Dame, Ind.: Ave Maria Press.

OXFORD CONFERENCES. Hilary Term, 1900. THE LIFE OF GRACE. By *Raphael M. Moss, O. P.*, Lector in Sacred Theology. 12mo, pp. 146. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

THE CARDINAL'S SNUFF BOX. By *Henry Harland.* 8vo, pp. 319. London and New York: John Lane.

HIS FIRST AND LAST APPEARANCE. By *Francis J. Finn, S. J.* With illustrations by Charles C. Svendsen. 8vo, pp., 213. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE HOUSE OF EGREMONT. A novel by *Molly Elliott Sewall.* Illustrated by C. Relyea. 12mo, pp. 515. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

RITA. By *Laura E. Richards.* Illustrated by Ethelred B. Barry. 12mo, pp. 246. Boston: Dana, Estes & Co.

SNOW WHITE; or, The House in the Wood. By *Laura E. Richards.* 12mo, pp. 93. Boston: Dana, Estes & Co.

VISITS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori.* 24mo. New York: Benziger Brothers.

NEW MANUAL OF THE SACRED HEART. 24mo. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE PILGRIM'S GUIDE TO ROME. Translated from the Work of M. l'Abbe Launonier by Charles J. Munich. 24 mo, pp. 242, with map. New York: Benziger Brothers.

CHATTERBOX. Edited by J. Erskine Clarke, M. A. 1 vol., 8vo, pp. 412. Boston: Dana, Estes & Co.

70758

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

PERIODICAL